Foreign Broadcast Information Service 50 ANNIVERSARY 1941 - 1991

# Daily Report

# Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-094
Wednesday
15 May 1991

# Daily Report
## Soviet Union

*FBIS-SOV-91-094* *15 May 1991*

CONTENTS

**NOTICE TO READERS:** On 6 May 1991, the DAILY REPORT will begin phasing in new radio and television sourcelines that reflect how a station identifies itself. This change eliminates the "Domestic Service" and "Television Service" designations in favor of the station identification as broadcast. The presence of a new sourceline reflects this change in policy, rather than the establishment of a new station or network.

**NOTICE TO READERS:** An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

### ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Last Missiles Destroyed Under INF Treaty *[PRAVDA 13 May]* ..... 1
Gen Medvedev Notes Final Missile Destruction *[IZVESTIYA 12 May]* ..... 2
START Treaty Said Near Ready for Signing *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 3

### WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Presidential Spokesman Gives Briefing 14 May ..... 4
On Russian Presidency Poll *[TASS]* ..... 4
'Full-Scale' Summit With U.S. Discussed *[TASS]* ..... 4
PRC's Jiang Zemin Visit Previewed *[TASS]* ..... 4
Bessmertnykh's Mideast Tour Viewed *[TASS]* ..... 5
Moiseyev's U.S. Visit Previewed *[TASS]* ..... 5
Italy's Andreotti's Visit Previewed *[TASS]* ..... 5
U.S. 'Interference' Noted; E. Europe Discussed *[TASS]* ..... 6
Shevardnadze on Rumors of Future UN Position *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 14 May]* ..... 6
UN Commission Endorses Disarmament Proposals *[TASS]* ..... 7
Official Speaks at UN on International Law *[TASS]* ..... 7

### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

#### United States & Canada

Bogachev Views Bush Statement on Chemical Arms *[TASS]* ..... 8
Paper Says GRU Double Agent Defects to U.S.
*[London THE SUNDAY TELEGRAPH 12 May]* ..... 8
Russian TV Reports Defection *[Moscow TV]* ..... 9
IZVESTIYA on KAL-007 Court Case *[13 May]* ..... 9
U.S. Seen Pursuing 'Dual Policy' on USSR *[IZVESTIYA 13 May]* ..... 10
Paper Indifferent on U.S. Envoy Replacement *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 14 May]* ..... 11

#### China

Jiang Zemin Gives Journalists Pre-Visit Briefing *[TASS]* ..... 11
Foreign Ministry Official on Jiang Zemin Visit *[TASS]* ..... 12
Gidaspov on Jiang Zemin Visit's Significance *[Moscow International]* ..... 12
Jiang Zemin Visit Agenda Previewed *[INTERFAX]* ..... 14
Rogachev Notes 'Mutual Understanding' With PRC *[TASS]* ..... 15
IZVESTIYA on Sino-U.S. Trade Links *[12 May]* ..... 16
PRC Trade Official Views Joint Economic Ties *[PRAVDA 12 May]* ..... 16

#### Southeast Asia & Pacific

Commentary Hails Do Muoi Visit to Moscow *[Moscow International]* ..... 17

### Near East & South Asia

Bessmertnykh Holds Follow-Up Talks With Al-Asad *[TASS]* ..... 18
Bessmertnykh Meets With 'Arafat in Geneva *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 18
TASS Reports Meeting ..... 19
Bessmertnykh: Conference Chances 'Increasing' *[IZVESTIYA 15 May]* ..... 19
Bessmertnykh, Baker Talks Reviewed *[Moscow TV]* ..... 19
Bessmertnykh Remarks in Riyadh, Damascus Viewed *[TASS]* ..... 19
Mideast Opinions on Bessmertnykh Tour Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 20
Foreign Ministry Issues Statement on Afghanistan *[TASS]* ..... 21

### West Europe

CPSU Delegation Attends German CP Congress ..... 21
Departs Moscow 9 May *[TASS]* ..... 21
CPSU Message to Congress *[PRAVDA 9 May]* ..... 22
Prokofyev Meets SPD Official *[TASS]* ..... 22
Prokofyev Addresses Congress *[TASS]* ..... 22
Delegation Departs 14 May *[TASS]* ..... 23
Soviet Citizen Sentenced for Spying in Italy *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 May]* ..... 23

### Latin America & Caribbean

U.S. 'Propaganda,' Nicaraguan Unrest Linked *[PRAVDA 8 May]* ..... 23

## NATIONAL AFFAIRS

### Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Changes Military Service Law *[Moscow TV]* ..... 26
Deputies Meet in Committees 14 May *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 26
Sharin Discusses Security Law 13 May *[Moscow TV]* ..... 26

### Political & Social

Aide Views Gorbachev-Yeltsin Republics Formula *[TASS]* ..... 27
Gorbachev Chairs Cabinet Session 15 May *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 27
Shcherbakov on Crisis Measures *[Moscow TV]* ..... 27
Council of CPSU Secretaries Holds Meeting *[TASS]* ..... 28
INTERFAX Head on Gorbachev-Yeltsin Accord *[Tokyo KYODO]* ..... 28
Academician Views Interrepublican Agreement *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 29
TASS Reviews Soviet Central Press for 15 May ..... 29
Leningrad Air Traffic Controllers To Strike *[Radio Rossii]* ..... 30
Politicians Debate President's Resignation *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 18]* ..... 30
Law Enforcement Committee's Functions Outlined *[IZVESTIYA 11 May]* ..... 32
TASS To Produce Documentary Films *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 33
PRAVDA Calls for Press Free of 'Relics' *[14 May]* ..... 33
Perestroyka Association Chief on Perestroyka *[PRAVDA 2 May]* ..... 34
Lukyanov Interviewed on Work *[Moscow TV]* ..... 35

### Economic

Economy Shows Further Recession in April *[IZVESTIYA 15 May]* ..... 46
Cabinet of Ministers Discusses Economic Forecast *[IZVESTIYA 14 May]* ..... 47
Miners Union Proposes 20 May Moscow Congress *[Moscow International]* ..... 49

### Agricultural

Chemical Shortage Hits Stavropol Grain Farmers *[PRAVDA 13 May]* ..... 49
Early May Weather, Crop Development Described *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 14 May]* ..... 49
Agrarian Bodies Support Ryzhkov Candidacy *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 12 May]* ..... 50

### Scientific

Soviet-European Space Conference Begins *[TASS]* ..... 51

### Military

All-Army CPSU Committee's Surkov Interviewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 May]* ..... 51
First All-Army Party Conference Reported *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Apr]* ..... 54
Gorbachev Speech at Conference *[Moscow TV]* ..... 55
CPSU Military Commission Discusses Conversion *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Apr]* ..... 57

## REGIONAL AFFAIRS

### Baltic Republics

Baltic Deputies Attend Human Rights Meeting *[Riga Radio]* ..... 59
Latvians To Request Soviet Troop Withdrawal *[TASS]* ..... 59
Latvia's Aboltinsh Shrugs Off Moscow's Threats *[Duesseldorf HANDELSBLATT 14 May]* ..... 59
Latvia Works Out Grain Production Program *[Riga Radio]* ..... 60
Latvian Penal System Could Lose Conscripts *[IZVESTIYA 12 May]* ..... 60
Rally Shows Declining Support for 'Sajudis' *[PRAVDA 13 May]* ..... 60
Lithuanian Official on Goods Available For Sale *[Vilnius Radio]* ..... 61
Vilnius Protests Radio, TV Center Occupation *[Vilnius Radio]* ..... 62
Lithuanian President Pays Visit to Chicago *[BALTFAX]* ..... 62
Meets With Emigres *[Vilnius Radio]* ..... 62

### RSFSR

Continuing Reportage on Yeltsin's CSFR Visit ..... 62
Discusses Future Ties With Dubcek *[TASS]* ..... 62
Meets Havel, Conveys Greetings *[TASS]* ..... 63
Comments on Visit Results *[Moscow TV]* ..... 63
Reportage on Yeltsin Visit to Czechoslovaki *[cross-reference]* ..... 64
Yeltsin, Khasbulatov Attend Presidium Session *[Moscow TV]* ..... 64
Opening of Russian TV Service; Logo Reported *[Moscow TV]* ..... 64
Chairman Issues Statement *[PRAVDA 14 May]* ..... 65
Kravchenko on Joint-Stock Leningrad TV Company *[IZVESTIYA 11 May]* ..... 66
Ryzhkov Currently Drawing Up Election Program *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 12 May]* ..... 66
Cited on Campaign Platform *[Moscow International]* ..... 66
Campaign Leader Comments *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 May]* ..... 66
Nominated by Over 500 Groups *[TASS]* ..... 67
RSFSR Electoral Commission Chairman Cited *[PRAVDA 15 May]* ..... 68
Presidency Candidates Tardy in Registering *[PRAVDA 15 May]* ..... 68
RSFSR Presidential Hopefuls Detailed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 14 May]* ..... 69
RSFSR Communist Party Holds Plenary Meeting ..... 70
Yields Few Practical Results *[TASS]* ..... 70
Melnikov, Sokolov Deliver Reports *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 May]* ..... 71
Communist Party Office in Kaliningrad Bombed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 14 May]* ..... 71
Communist Party Secretary Assails Yakovlev *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 7 May]* ..... 71
Russian Militia's Departyization Protested *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 12 May]* ..... 75
Isayev Airs Views on Land Reform Difficulties *[TASS]* ..... 76
Acting Russian KGB Chief Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 11 May]* ..... 76
RSFSR Law on State Taxation Service *[cross-reference]* ..... 77

### Western Republics

Moldovan Supreme Soviet Begins Work 14 May *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 77
Proposal on Moldova's Secession Fails *[TASS]* ..... 77
Moldovan Law on Property *[cross-reference]* ..... 77
Ukraine's Fokin To Press for Economic Sovereignty *[Kiev International]* ..... 77

Communist Role in Ukraine Legislature Viewed *[RADYANSKA UKRAYINA]* ..... 78
Stepan Khmara Trial Postponed in Ukraine *[Moscow TV]* ..... 80
Belorussian Decree on April 91 Strikes *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 27 Apr]* ..... 80

**Caucasus**

Continuing Reportage on South Ossetian Problem ..... 81
State of Emergency Declared *[TASS]* ..... 81
'Transported' S. Ossetians Noted *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 82
Presence of USSR Troops Protested *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 23 Apr]* ..... 82
Georgian Presidential Election Schedule Detailed *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 23 Apr]* ..... 82
Final Six Candidates for Presidential Election *[Tbilisi Radio]* ..... 82
Georgian Presidential Candidate in Militia Raid *[IZVESTIYA 14 May]* ..... 83
Georgian Presidential Candidate Criticized *[TASS]* ..... 83
Georgian Foreign Minister on Visit to France *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 26 Apr]* ..... 84
Georgian Minister Protests to USSR Counterpart *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 23 Apr]* ..... 84
Georgian Government Chairman on Economy *[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA 17 Apr]* ..... 85
Internal Troops' Actions in NKAO Explained *[TASS]* ..... 88
Soviet Actions Seen as 'Direct Aggression' *[IZVESTIYA 14 May]* ..... 89
Tension Persists in Nagorno-Karabakh Region *[INTERFAX]* ..... 90
Situation 'Not Calm' *[TASS]* ..... 90
Azerbaijan Establishes Security Council *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 90
Azerbaijani Militia Impedes Reporters *[PRAVDA 13 May]* ..... 90

## Last Missiles Destroyed Under INF Treaty

*PM1405110791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 May 91 Second Edition pp 1, 4*

[Report by special correspondent A. Gorokhov: "An Explosion That Will Save the World? PRAVDA Special Correspondent Reports from the Kapustin Yar Test Center"]

[Excerpts] Astrakhan Oblast—The last RSD-10 (SS-20) solid-fuel mobile missiles were destroyed at 1530 hours, Moscow time, at the Kapustin Yar state test center, located in the trans-Volga steppes on the territory of Astrakhan Oblast. The first and most important stage of the Soviet-American Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles has been fully implemented. [passage omitted]

...Early in the morning of 12 May, before flying to Kapustin Yar, I talked with Colonel General B. Omelichev, first deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff.

"We have fulfilled our commitments," Bronislav Aleksandrovich told me, "and destroyed, counting the last two, 1,846 missiles of two classes—intermediate and shorter range.

[Gorokhov] What types were they?

[Omelichev] The intermediate-range missiles include 654 "Pioner" RSD-10 systems, 149 R-12's, six R-14's, and 80 RK-55 cruise missiles. As for shorter-range missiles, we are talking about 718 "Temp" OTR-22's and 239 "Oka" OTR-23's.

[Gorokhov] So by destroying nearly 2,000 nuclear missiles we have taken the first step on the difficult road to a world without weapons?

[Omelichev] Quite right. The program announced by M.S. Gorbachev on 15 January 1986 to rid mankind completely of nuclear weapons and make the transition to a nonviolent, nuclear-free world is becoming a tangible reality, as I see it. I would point out that for its part the United States has destroyed 846 missiles of similar classes.

[Gorokhov] To be frank, this arithmetic will not be very clear to PRAVDA readers: After all, we have destroyed 1,000 more missiles!

[Omelichev] Yes, we have destroyed more weapons. But the total destruction of the aforementioned classes of missiles is in our security interests. Why? In the first place, with their destruction there is less likelihood of a regional nuclear conflict, as we say, that might develop into a global catastrophe. This, in turn, lessens the danger of war in general. Second, the United States has withdrawn from West Europe and destroyed all its missiles that were capable of reaching the territory of our country in 8-10 minutes, that is, capable of carrying out strategic tasks in relation to the Soviet Union. Finally, as a result of the treaty, we have guarantees that U.S. intermediate- and shorter-range missiles will not turn up near either the western or the eastern borders of the Soviet Union.

[Gorokhov] You mean that our country's defense capability has not suffered?

[Omelichev] Absolutely. The global strategic military balance has not been upset as a result of the treaty's implementation. Judge for yourself: The vehicles capable of delivering around four percent of all existing nuclear weapons to their targets have been destroyed. But the Soviet Union's defense capability is ensured by all the other nuclear and conventional weapons.... [Omelichev ends]

The final question I put to my interlocutor concerned the impact of the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles on the prospects of the disarmament process as a whole. To be frank, there were a few people, were there not, in the West and in our country, who were accustomed to relying entirely on force?

"The signing of the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles in 1987," Colonel General B. Omelichev reckons, "paved the way for other accords. I would point out that on 19 November last year in Paris the heads of 20 European countries, the United States, and Canada signed a treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe. That same year the USSR and U.S. presidents signed an agreement on the destruction and nonproduction of chemical weapons. The preparation of the Soviet-American treaty on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive armaments is in its final stages. Although, to be frank, one gets the impression that very recently the U.S. side's interest in completing the elaboration of this agreement has declined somewhat...."

Let us return to Kapustin Yar, to the battlefield where the command "Fire!" has already been given, incidentally, by Lieutenant Colonel A. Guba, who gave the order for the first demolition three years ago. A fireball appeared above the steppes in a matter of a few fractions of a second. In fact, the great story, the great strategy of peace, is unfolding in these expanses, which have only just cast off their bright spring attire.

The world is now a little bit safer. That is no exaggeration. For instance, one of the three warheads on each RSD-10 would be enough to wipe out life if not on one continent, then on a good part of it. The nigh-on 2,700 U.S. and Soviet missiles could turn the entire Old World and the New World into a lifeless desert.

I would also like to say the following: In the course of implementing the treaty our military is acquiring unique experience both in organizing both the actual destruction of armaments and in working in conditions of strict monitoring by U.S. inspection groups.

Lieutenant General V. Medvedev, chief of the USSR National Center for the Reduction of the Nuclear Danger, believes:

"An important aspect of the implementation of the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles is the well-thought-out system for monitoring the observance of its provisions by means of on-site inspections. The inspections have confirmed the correctness and viability of the selected monitoring procedures and measures."

Colonel V. Tselishchev, one of the Soviet military inspectors just returned from the United States, whom I have known for a long time and who was present in Longhorn, Texas, on 6 May at the destruction of the last U.S. Pershing-2 missile, told me:

"As I watched the Pershing solid propellant burning, I thought: Were it not for the treaty, this missile could have been aimed at Moscow, Minsk, Kiev...."

There is obviously no need to comment at length on the words uttered by the colonel, who served 22 years in the missile forces, on alert duty, in particular with "Pioner" missiles. Let us express our appreciation, readers, to those who even today, on this truly historic day, are carrying out their alert duty, ensuring our safety, and, in the end, world peace.

## Gen Medvedev Notes Final Missile Destruction

*PM1405150991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 May 91 Union Edition p 1*

[Interview with Lieutenant General V. Medvedev, chief of the USSR National Nuclear Risk Reduction Center, by correspondent V. Litovkin; place and date not given: "By Destroying Missiles We Strengthen Trust"]

[Text] On 12 May the last Soviet RSD-10 intermediate-range missile will be destroyed at the Kapustin Yar range; a few days earlier the United States destroyed its last ground-launched cruise missile 1 May and its last Pershing-2 6 May. Thus the final point of the treaty signed by the Soviet Union and the United States in Washington 8 December 1987 on eliminating their intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is being fulfilled.

What did these missiles represent, how did the elimination process go, and how was it monitored? Lieutenant General V. Medvedev, chief of the USSR National Nuclear Risk Reduction Center, now talks to our correspondent about that:

[Medvedev] The treaty signed by M. Gorbachev and R. Reagan in December 1987 envisaged the elimination of all the intermediate- and shorter-range missiles in our countries' possession, in other words, those missiles with an operational range of 500-1,000 km and also 1,000-5,500 km. There are six types of Soviet missiles and three types of U.S. missiles. Our missiles included the RSD-10, R-12, and R-14 intermediate-range missiles and the ground-launched RK-55 cruise missile, which we tested but had not deployed by the time that the treaty was signed. It was included in the treaty as a special category.

Our shorter-range missiles—the OTR-22 and OTR-23—have an operating range of 500-1,000 km, as I have already said. But there is a special feature to the OTR-23. Its range is less than 500 km, but nevertheless it is included in the treaty. We agreed to this political step to ensure the signing and ratification of the accords that were reached.

The U.S. side has eliminated the Pershing-2 and the BGM-109G cruise missile—these are intermediate-range missiles—and also the shorter-range Pershing-1A. In all, the USSR has eliminated 1,846 missiles—this can be said now—and the United States has eliminated 846.

The treaty expects that our countries will do away with these missiles entirely. The production and testing of missiles was banned during their elimination—in other words, these two classes of missiles have been removed entirely from our nuclear arsenals.

The significance of this step is obvious if you consider that the nuclear potential of such missiles exceeds all the charges ever detonated by mankind. In addition, their flight time was so short that the danger of their use created a destabilizing situation on the European continent. After all, this is where the main potential was deployed. Admittedly, we kept a certain quantity of missiles of this type in the Asian part of the country, but they were also eliminated.

[Litovkin] How was the destruction of the missiles verified? How were the problems that occurred during elimination resolved? I know that problems occurred on both sides.

[Medvedev] The distinguishing feature of the verification mechanism itself was that for the first time it included such an effective measure as the extensive use of on-site verification. In three years of the treaty's operation we carried out around 250 inspections of U.S. facilities in Europe and across the ocean while the Americans conducted nearly 530 inspections on our territory. The discrepancy is because of the fact that there were more sites to check on our side.

In addition, various facilities were subject to inspection—operational missile bases, arsenals, training sites, missile test sites... For example, Barnaul, Novosibirsk, Postavy, Malorita, Karmilava... The list is long—we had 117 such facilities, including the plants in Votkinsk, Petropavlovsk in north Kazakhstan, and Sverdlovsk. The U.S. side had 32 facilities, including the Martin-Marietta plant (Maryland), the Hercules plant (Utah), the depots at Pueblo (Colorado), and the Redstone Arsenal (Alabama)... All these facilities were inspected on a quota basis at short notice—16 hours after the inspection group arrived in the country.

The plants at Votkinsk and Magna (Utah) were verified on a permanent basis. The inspection groups there were simply changed after a certain time.

We and the U.S. specialists visited the destruction sites as often as necessary to be sure of the complete destruction of the missiles and to register this process.

As for conflicts, I can say this much: On a purely technical level there was friction. That is what work is like, especially when it is something completely new and unfamiliar, but we always overcame the friction through mutual respect and amicability. Sometimes with the help of the Soviet-U.S. verification commission, which was created specially for that purpose. On the whole, each missile blown up or cut up increased our mutual trust, not only between the Soviet and U.S. officers and specialists but also the population of the two countries.

[Litovkin] Does it not seem to you that, although blowing missiles up may be effective from the propaganda viewpoint, it does not make sense economically or environmentally? Would it not be better to crush them or cut them up to use them in the national economy afterward?

[Medvedev] Propaganda has nothing to do with it. We chose our method of destruction on the basis of technical potential. We were free to choose any method but opted for detonation. It is more practical. From the environmental viewpoint, there is no great difference between igniting a solid-fuel motor and blowing it up. The only difference is that one process is quick, the other takes longer.

In all instances we conducted a preliminary environmental study and reported its results to the USSR Supreme Soviet, and it was acknowledged that the level of environmental pollution did not exceed the natural level. Furthermore, in each specific instance all the conditions were observed.... For example, we waited for the wind to blow away from housing and so on. That is what happened on our side and the U.S. side.

Incidentally, before the missiles were destroyed everything of value that could be used in the national economy was removed from them. The launchers were dismantled in such a way that they could not launch missiles any more but the chassis could be used. As you know, they are now operating as truck tractors and are a base for cranes....

Generally speaking, if you think back over this past period, it may be said that we have begun looking to the future with greater optimism than three years ago.

## START Treaty Said Near Ready for Signing

*LD1305145291 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 13 May 91*

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] The Soviet Union and the United States have scrapped all their medium- and shorter-range missiles. These were capable of carrying a nuclear charge from 500 to 5,500 km. The United States got rid of its last missile of this kind on 1 May. The Soviet Union did the same on Sunday [12 May] at Kapustin Yar, the base where the first Soviet ballistic missile had been launched. This completes action on the key provision of a treaty—the INF—which Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan signed in December 1987. For the next 10 years the two nations will be carrying out inspections to make sure that neither one nor the other should re-adopt missiles of this kind. Now what is the next step to bring about nuclear disarmament? We put this question to Yuriy Solton, and this is what he writes:

A treaty to slash strategic arms should come next. If the Soviet Union, the United States, and all other countries want to survive, they badly need such a treaty. Strategic missiles are capable of delivering powerful nuclear charges to almost any place in the world. Delays in preparing the 500-page treaty, especially artificial ones, arouse concern. The present delay I'm sure is artificial. There are political reasons behind it.

Although cuts in strategic weapons draw objections from some people in this country, too, it's the United States (?who) have virtually conditioned the completion of the START treaty for strategic offensive arms on ironing out differences that crop into the interpretation of an agremeent already signed—it's the treaty for conventional armed forces in Europe. The United States believes re-subordinating three Soviet motorized infantry divisions with their hardware to coast guard forces clashes with the treaty and damages the trust that disarmament needs so badly.

I'm not inclined to justify either side, writes Yuriy Solton. All I want to say is this: According to both Soviet and American authorities, the dispute can be easily settled. Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush discussed the issue over the telephone on Saturday. Moscow is sending Chief of General Staff Mikhail Moiseyev to Washington. The two presidents hope the talks in the American capital will help adopt a decision that both sides could accept. The other START issues will cause no problems.

I believe that despite the present delay, the treaty will be ready for signing at the Soviet-U.S. summit to be held one of these coming months. What supports my optimism are the latest personal contacts between Mr. Gorbachev and Mr. Bush. The two leaders exchanged messages and discussed over the telephone Soviet-American relations and differences with the sincerity and trust so characteristic of both.

## Presidential Spokesman Gives Briefing 14 May

### On Russian Presidency Poll

*LD1405162191 Moscow TASS in English 1552 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS correspondents Konstantin Voitsekhovich and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Excerpts] Moscow May 14 TASS—Speaking at a news briefing here today, Soviet presidential spokesman Vitaliy Ignatenko briefed journalists on the programme of the visit to the Soviet Union by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, that begins on May 15. [passage omitted]

Asked by journalists who the Soviet president would vote for at the Russian Federation presidential elections, Ignatenko said: "in any case, the Soviet president does not consider it possible and correct to speak in favour of one presidential candidate or another. This can be viewed as the Soviet president's involvement in the election campaign of a candidate. In this context, Gorbachev prefers restraint. The president would express his view by giving his vote for the programme that would aim to overcome the crisis, to create decent conditions of life in Russia", to promote constructive interaction with other republics in building a single union."

Commenting on the situation in Armenia and Azerbaijan, Ignatenko emphasized that all decrees and instructions from the Soviet president are devoted to disarming illegally armed military units on both sides.

Ignatenko dismissed as fabrications reports in the German newspaper BILD about the alleged "negative pronouncements" by Mikhail Gorbachev about former general secretary of the SED Central Committee Erich Honecker.

Asked about Gorbachev's possible participation in the G-7 meeting, Ignatenko said: "We work towards solving this serious and complex problem". So far, the president has not received any serious invitation to this meeting, he said.

Ignatenko said Gorbachev will visit Norway on June 5 to deliver a lecture at the nobel committee in Oslo. On June 6, the president will pay a brief working visit to Sweden.

### 'Full-Scale' Summit With U.S. Discussed

*LD1405143291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1330 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS correspondents Konstantin Voytsekhovich and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow, 14 May (TASS)—The USSR is firmly oriented toward partnership with the American leadership and progress on all matters on the Soviet-American agenda. This was said today at a briefing by Vitaliy Ignatenko, head of the USSR president's press service.

Going back to last week's telephone conversation between the Presidents of the USSR and United States, Vitaliy Ignatenko recalled that the parties had ascertained considerable improvement in bilateral relations of late and expressed the hope that this process would continue in the future.

In this connection he stressed that USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev "supported the idea of holding a full-scale summit meeting this summer that would culminate in the signing of the treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons".

The head of the Soviet president's press service drew attention to the accord reached in the course of the telephone conversation between the USSR and U.S. leaders for Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, to pay a visit to the United States.

He announced that Mikhail Moiseyev will hold talks on 20 May with Reginald Bartholomew, under secretary of state for international security affairs, and the next day with Colin Powell, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is not ruled out that the chief of the Soviet General Staff may be received by U.S. President George Bush during his trip.

Vitaliy Ignatenko said that the very fact of talks being held at such a serious military-political level is seen by the Soviet side as "very promising." In his view, the sides are now "definitely set on" an early attainment of a definitive comprehensive solution to the problems confronting the USSR and the United States in the disarmament field.

"All the visible signs are," the head of the USSR president's press service remarked, "that these talks will end in success, since General Moiseyev will not be going to the United States 'empty-handed'."

### PRC's Jiang Zemin Visit Previewed

*LD1405144591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1416 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS correspondents Konstantin Voytsekhovich and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow, 14 May (TASS)—Speaking at a briefing today, Vitaliy Ignatenko, head of the USSR president's press service, acquainted journalists in detail with the itinerary of the visit to the Soviet Union by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, which begins on 15 May. He recalled that this is the first visit by a PRC leader since the visit to the Soviet Union by Mao Zedong.

Replying to journalists' questions, the head of the press service of the Soviet head of state stressed that Mikhail Gorbachev will receive Jiang Zemin first and foremost as general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He also noted the serious, positive changes that have taken place in relations between the CPSU and the CPC and the intensification of inter-party contacts which are developing "very well and have very major reserves and prospects". Vitaliy Ignatenko voiced the hope that such contacts will be deepened during the forthcoming visit.

### Bessmertnykh's Mideast Tour Viewed

*LD1405150891 Moscow TASS in English 1500 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS correspondents Konstantin Voitsekhovich and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow May 14 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev follows "with great interest" Soviet Foreign Minister Alexandr Bessmertnykh's visit to the Middle East, Presidential Spokesman Vitaliy Ignatenko told a news briefing today.

There has appeared a real chance to break a deadlock in this region, Ignatenko continued. He quoted the Soviet president as saying that the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. Secretary of State had managed to find "a sufficient number of solutions", so that the Middle Eastern process could develop positively.

In reply to a question about Bessmertnykh's visit to Israel, Ignatenko said that Soviet policy acquired a multiplane character which it lacked.

"The hitherto unused potential began to work," he said, "I think this is a very important result".

Ignatenko commented with optimism on prospects for a peace conference in the Middle East.

### Moiseyev's U.S. Visit Previewed

*LD1405151491 Moscow TASS in English 1503 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS correspondent Konstantin Voitsekhovich and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow May 14 TASS—The Soviet Union intends to maintain firm partnership with the American leadership and seek progress in all questions of the Soviet-American agenda, presidential press secretary Vitaliy Ignatenko told a briefing today.

Recalling last week's telephone talk between the Soviet and American presidents, Ignatenko noted that the sides pointed to a considerable improvement in bilateral relations in the recent past and expressed hope for the continuation of this process in future.

He stressed that President Mikhail Gorbachev "is committed to the idea of holding a summit this summer, which could be crowned by the signing of a treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons (START)".

The press secretary called attention to an understanding reached during the telephone conversation on a visit to the United States by Chief of the Soviet General Staff Mikhail Moiseyev.

He said that Moiseyev would hold talks with U.S. Under-Secretary of State Reginald Bartholomew on May 20 and the next day with Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Colin Powell. It is probable that the chief of the Soviet General Staff will be received by President George Bush.

The Soviet side regards the forthcoming talks at a high military and political level as "very promising", Ignatenko stressed. In his opinion, the two sides are "in the mood" for the earliest possible final solution of problems facing the USSR and the United States in disarmament.

"These talks will evidently be a success, since General Moiseyev will go 'not empty-handed' to the United States," Ignatenko noted.

### Italy's Andreotti's Visit Previewed

*LD1405152291 Moscow TASS in English 1509 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Konstantin Voitsekhovskich and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow May 14 TASS—Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti is due to arrive in the USSR for a one-day visit next week, Presidential Spokesman Vitaliy Ignatenko said at a briefing at the Soviet Foreign Ministry's press centre.

He said that Andreotti would be "a desired and privileged interlocutor in the Kremlin", and expressed hope that the Italian prime minister would come to Moscow with "a package of really important issues to discuss".

The Kremlin expects "a serious talk on the situation in the Middle East, Mediterranean, Eastern Europe and perhaps separately the state of affairs in Yugoslavia," he said.

The Soviet side will brief Andreotti on the state of affairs in the USSR and prospects of developments in the near future, the spokesman said.

Questions of economy will also be discussed, Ignatenko said. These will probably be a Fiat automobile project, a programme of establishing agricultural complexes in the Krasnodar and the Stavropol regions (south of Russia), a gas energy project, and others.

"The Kremlin treats Andreotti's visit very seriously, believing that many issues could be discussed with Italy, as a very reliable partner, with allied, partnership relations shaping with it," Ignatenko said. Italy took second, after West Germany, place in foreign economic cooperation with the USSR, he noted.

Ignatenko recalled the treaty of friendship and cooperation, which was signed by Mikhail Gorbachev and Giulio Andreotti last November, positively assessing the fact that Italy "takes seriously the provisions of the agreement in its relations with third countries, and in contacts in European structures".

"The feeling in Moscow is that the treaty really functions, although the procedure of its ratification by Italy's parliament is not yet over," he said.

## U.S. 'Interference' Noted; E. Europe Discussed

*LD1405201191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1745 GMT 14 May 91*

[Text] Moscow, 14 May (TASS)—It is officially announced here today that at the International Affairs Committee's session on 14 May, in view of the interest shown by people's deputies, a USSR Foreign Ministry report was presented on the hearings held at the U.S. Congress Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, in which individual leaders of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian Soviet Socialist Republics took part.

In the course of the exchanges of opinion, members of the committee and deputies attending the session noted that it is hard to regard the hearing as anything but an attempt at interference in the USSR's internal affairs. The Soviet legislators expressed serious concern at the actions taken by some congressmen regarding the situation in the republics of the Soviet Baltic region.

In the Soviet Union the improvement in relations with the United States that has been achieved in the past few years and the new climate of trust that has taken shape between the two countries are highly valued, and it is now important to consolidate the positive trends that have taken shape and ensure that officials do not overstep generally accepted international norms.

The participants in the session expressed the hope that foreign legislators will keep their initiatives concerning particular regions of the Soviet Union in line with the criterion of noninterference in its internal affairs. Such a realistic approach is especially important now that a constitutional mechanism of discussion of issues of relations between the republics and the Union center has been established and started working.

Deputy Foreign Affairs Minister Yuliy Kvitsinskiy delivered a report on the concept of new political treaties of the Soviet Union with the Eastern European countries. At the root of the concept lie the tasks of strengthening political cooperation as an important element of the security of the USSR and its Eastern European partners, taking into account their mutual dependence in a regional and all-European context, long-standing historical traditions, the spiritual closeness of our peoples, and the positive experience of interaction. It is a question of implementing in modern conditions the principles of good-neighborliness, a question of expanding contacts between the USSR and the countries of the region, and of insuring regularity of political dialogue at all levels.

Members of the committee stressed the importance of placing the USSR's relations with its neighbors in East and southeast Europe on new contactual basis; they stressed the significance of the Soviet-Romanian Treaty of Cooperation, Good-Neighborliness and Friendship, signed in April, as the first step in this direction. The forthcoming drafting and conclusion of treaties with Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, and the CSFR should promote the activation of relations with those states, and the overcoming of the familiar "pause" which has as a result of the objective circumstances since the events of 1989-1990 in Eastern Europe. The new treaties, it was noted at the session, are destined to insure mutual trust in political and military questions, including non-participation in any groups or alliances damaging to one another's interests, and to give scope for development of interaction in the fields of politics, economy, science and technology, culture, and in building up legislative contacts and exchanges through all channels.

## Shevardnadze on Rumors of Future UN Position

*PM1405154191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 May 91 p 1*

[Correspondent Ye. Ovcharenko report: "Will Shevardnadze Be UN Head?"]

[Text] New York—Is Eduard Shevardnadze really thinking of the possibility of becoming UN secretary general? The question of how realistic this is has arisen following reports in a German newspaper and in France's LE MONDE.

Even prior to these, similar suppositions had, in principle, crept into the U.S. press: Then Shevardnadze's name was mentioned along with that of Margaret Thatcher. Moreover, I know for sure that the leader of one European country who met with the former Soviet foreign minister not so long ago spoke of this prospect perfectly seriously.

"What is the formal procedure for approving a candidacy for the post of UN secretary general?" I asked Aleksandr Taukach, one of Perez de Cuellar's press secretaries.

"The Security Council discusses candidacies at its closed conference, after which, having chosen one among them, it recommends it for examination to the General Assembly. The principle of the right of 'veto' operates at the conference—i.e. if just one of the five permanent member powers uses it, the candidacy does not pass. Neither the press nor the public is admitted to this discussion, and the General Assembly decides the question by a secret ballot. A simple majority is needed for approval."

As an official, Aleksandr assured me that the organization's documents do not contain any other interpretations, explanations, or restrictions regarding the question of who can be the UN secretary general. Although from my own experience of work in the UN lobby and conversations with colleagues I can say that journalists hold the opinion that unwritten rules still exist on this question. For example, that the organization must not be headed by a representative of one of the "five" countries. Or that a candidate must be fluent in the two working languages—English and French—and there has not yet been another one. Or that there is an unspoken order in which the continents take their turn at the helm: It is now Africa's turn.

In any case, the question of the UN leader will arise at the next General Assembly session this fall. Quite recently, in response to a journalist's question—"Do you

rule out the possibility of nominating your own candidacy for a third term?"—Perez de Cuellar replied: "The United Nations is a democratic organization, and from my viewpoint two terms are quite enough."

Yet: Does Shevardnadze aspire to the post of UN leader? I put this question to Eduard Amvrosiyevich, who is currently in the United States.

[Shevardnadze] I have not seen the articles, but I think that this was spoken of theoretically there. In general, however, there are such rumors and there have been articles in the Soviet and foreign press, that such a question might arise. No one has officially offered me anything. But if or when this question arises, then I can define my position.

It is my opinion, however, that the United Nations now has a good secretary general. He is a unique individual: a sociable, very flexible and authoritative politician. He must be asked to stay on for another term. This is the best solution.

[Ovcharenko] During your meeting with Bush, you spoke of credits for the USSR: Did the initiative for that discussion proceed from you or did Gorbachev, for example, ask you to do it?

[Shevardnadze] I will tell you frankly. Like any honest citizen, I have a feeling of anxiety: The people are suffering and are in torment, and there is no food, although prices have been raised. If we were able to purchase food for $1.5 billion, we would be able to remove the social tension that exists in the country. This would shore up the democratic transformations. Therefore, knowing that this question is being discussed in principle, I raised it with the U.S. President not as an official representative but as a citizen and a human being.

[Ovcharenko] Judging by the fact that you spoke with Gorbachev over the telephone before your trip here, do you continue to maintain relations with him since your resignation?

[Shevardnadze] Yes. There really was a conversation before my departure.

[Ovcharenko] Does this happen regularly?

[Shevardnadze] Yes. I would not say it happens every day.

### UN Commission Endorses Disarmament Proposals

*LD1405131991 Moscow TASS in English 0847 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Menkes]

[Text] New York, United Nations May 14 TASS—A series of recommendations for nuclear disarmament, a regional approach to disarmament, objective information on military affairs, and the role of science and technology in international security and disarmament has been endorsed by a session of the United Nations Commission on Disarmament, which ended here on Monday. The recommendations were in a report adopted at the final meeting of the session.

Debates and consultations lasted over three weeks and demonstrated the importance of results in efforts to limit arms and disarm, specifically, the INF treaty and nascent agreement on strategic offensive arms. However, many delegates believe that these steps should be supplemented by efforts towards multilateral disarmament.

Recommendations endorsed by the commission include further developing the exchange of information on military matters, involving U.N. regional centres in problems of peace and disarmament and drawing up a U.N. list on conventional arms supplies.

Emphasis was placed on continuing work on confidence-building measures, ensuring the security of non-nuclear states, banning the production of fissionable materials for nuclear weapons, and setting up zones of peace and zones free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

The role of science and technology in international security was discussed in detail for the first time. Participants agreed that it is important to channel scientific and technological progress constructively and make it serve peace, disarmament and development.

### Official Speaks at UN on International Law

*LD1405131591 Moscow TASS in English 0849 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Menkes]

[Text] New York May 14 TASS—An understanding of the world's interdependence and the desire to reach a consensus are becoming increasingly important to the world community, Sergei Lavrov, the head of the department for international organisations at the Soviet Foreign Ministry, told a briefing here on Monday.

These factors should be taken into account when discussing political, social and economic problems, including human rights.

Inter-state relations can be regulated only on the basis of international law, Lavrov said. It should be observed in all spheres, including those, which are not yet based on international law.

It is necessary to speak openly about all violations of international law and end double standards. The Soviet Union wants a new international order to be applied first and foremost to law.

The Soviet Union believes that reforms at the U.N. should not begin with amendments of the U.N. Charter, Lavrov said.

For decades, cold war realities kept the U.N. Security Council's potential half-opened. Only recently has it been fully used. Any country can participate in U.N. activities as envisaged by the existing regulations and procedures, he said.

## United States & Canada

### Bogachev Views Bush Statement on Chemical Arms

*LD1405214191 Moscow TASS in English 2125 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS analyst Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow May 14 TASS—President Bush on Monday made an important statement concerning changes in the U.S. policy with respect to chemical weapons. He made it clear that the United States was lifting its reservation regarding the 1925 Geneva Protocol banning the use of toxic agents during wars. The United States reserved the right to use toxic agents in response to a chemical weapon attack.

In addition, the U.S. President made clear that the United States would no longer insist on retaining two per cent of its present stock of chemical weapons—500 tonnes—after signing the chemical weapon convention that is currently being worked out in Geneva.

These decisions by Washington will take effect after the chemical weapons convention is enforced.

The history of chemical weapons negotiations is replete with dramatic events which now inspired hopes for a complete ban on this mass destruction weapons and now caused bitter disappointment. In 1968, the United States stopped the production of toxic agents but the Soviet Union failed to follow the example. Later, the two powers exchanged roles: in 1987, the Soviet Union halted the production of toxic agents but the United States started the output of binary toxic agents, a new kind of chemical weapon.

Chemical weapons negotiations progress was hampered by two interdependent factors—objective arising from the difficulties of verification and subjective rooted in the long-term mistrust between the USSR and the U.S. dating from the cold war years.

The U.S. military for a long time was opposed to the ban on chemical toxic agents as they were sure that the United States was too far removed from potential theatres of war in Europe and Asia and chemical weapons were no threat to the country.

The Soviet Union's practical large-scale measures aiming to reduce the level of military confrontation in Europe thawed the ice of mutual mistrust to a considerable degree. During the Soviet-U.S. summit off Malta, the U.S. President announced that the United States was ready to end the production of binary ammunition and later at the Washington summit the production of all toxic agents. An agreement was reached on a step-by-step liquidation of 98 per cent of the chemical weapon stocks in the Soviet Union and the United States and reducing them to the same level in both countries by the year 2002.

In July 1990, the United States began to withdraw its chemical weapons from German territory. Nevertheless, the work of representatives of 39 countries in Geneva to prepare a convention on a complete ban of chemical weapons and the elimination of stocks proceeded at a slow pace. Washington officials now admit that the Geneva negotiation process was being slowed down by the U.S. refusal to agree to a complete elimination of its chemical potential. Now, at long last, this obstacle will be removed.

It is appropriate to recall George Bush's statement in 1988, in which he said that if elected president, he would be remembered for one thing—a complete and comprehensive ban on chemical weapons. By far not all U.S. presidents have kept their election promises concerning arms control. There is every ground to believe that Bush's statement about chemical weapons was quite sincere.

As regards the Soviet Union, this country has never used toxic agents, deployed chemical weapons beyond its own territory or transferred chemical weapons to other countries. The Soviet Union favours the prompt adoption of a convention banning these mass destruction weapons and the complete elimination of stocks under close international scrutiny.

Some of the problems concerning chemical weapons are still awaiting their solution at Geneva negotiations. The position of some countries, including France, is not yet quite clear with regard to the proposal to fully eliminate all toxic agents in the next ten years.

However, hope is still alive that chemical weapons will be finally outlawed soon, for instance by the first half of 1992.

### Paper Says GRU Double Agent Defects to U.S.

*LD1205085191 London THE SUNDAY TELEGRAPH in English 12 May 91 P1*

[Article by Christopher Dobson: "Senior Soviet Double Agent Comes In From Cold"]

[Text] A senior Soviet intelligence officer, who secretly worked for the Americans as a double agent, has defected to the West.

Aleksandr Krapiva, 41, decided to make a run for it with his wife and two children only two months after being posted by the Kremlin to Austria. He is now being debriefed in the United States.

Over the years, Krapiva used a diplomatic cover to mask his real position as a senior officer of the GRU military intelligence service. It was suggested yesterday that the quality of secret information supplied to the CIA by Krapiva could well be compared with that delivered in the early 1960s by Col Oleg Penkovskiy, whose recruitment is now recognised as one of the West's biggest espionage coups.

Krapiva served at the Soviet embassy in Washington for four years from 1982. It appears that while he was there, the Americans realised he was in intelligence. He was contacted by the CIA and "turned". He was recalled to Moscow in 1986 in a routine reassignment and was at the heart of GRU operations until he was posted to Vienna last December. To have someone working "in place" in Moscow for the West for so long was a tremendous coup.

In Vienna, Krapiva was officially a first secretary at the Soviet Mission to the United Nations agencies. The importance of his work there lay in the fact that both the International Atomic Energy Agency and International Development Organisation have their headquarters in Vienna and are prime targets for high technology espionage.

Another target, just outside Vienna, is the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, a research body funded principally by the United States and the Soviet Union. Ten years ago, its secretary, the Soviet scientist Arkadiy Belozerov, was forced to resign after being exposed as a spy.

Krapiva apparently decided to make his break in February when he became alarmed, possibly by hints from the Austrian special branch that they knew he was GRU and were making their own attempt to recruit him.

On the night of February 24, he and his wife left the Soviet mission with their six-year-old daughter and 10-year-old son and made a dash into Germany, where they were met by CIA agents. The Soviet authorities Russians searched frantically for him and a week later, the Austrian Foreign Office told the Soviet embassy that Krapiva was in Germany under U.S. protection.

The GRU carries out most of the active espionage missions for the Kremlin. Its officers are heavily involved in the Soviet campaign to steal the West's hi-tech secrets.

### Russian TV Reports Defection

*LD1305224391 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2001 GMT 13 May 91*

[From the "Vesti" news program]

[Text] Sensation of the day: A high-ranking officer of a chief intelligence directorate, Aleksandr Krapiva, asked for asylum in the West. Together with his wife and two children he left Vienna, where he worked under the roof of the Soviet Embassy, and went to Germany, from where he was taken to the United States. THE SUNDAY TELEGRAPH, a British paper, points out that Krapiva was recruited by the CIA way back in the 1980's when he worked as a diplomat, a Soviet diplomat in Washington. The damage done by Krapiva to Soviet intelligence, notes THE SUNDAY TELEGRAPH, can only be compared with the catastrophic consequences of Colonel Penkovskiy's treachery at the start of the 1960's.

### IZVESTIYA on KAL-007 Court Case

*PM1305153191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 May 91 Union Edition p 1*

[Report by correspondent A. Shalnev: "Secret of the Korean Boeing 747: Investigation Continues"]

[Text] New York—The district appeal court which has been considering for several months the case of the South Korean Boeing KAL-007 downed near Sakhalin on the night of 1 September 1983 has decided to rule that the plane's crew were guilty of "a deliberate violation of their official duties" and to overturn the original verdict ordering Korean Airlines to pay bereaved relatives several tens of millions of dollars.

The appeal court explained the second part of its decision by referring to the Warsaw Convention, which sets an upper limit of $75,000 per death on compensation for passenger deaths.

However, even this sum has not been paid to a single relative yet. The reason lies in the extremely involved system of hearing suits and petitions. If, I was told, the relatives had immediately demanded the compensation stipulated by the Warsaw Convention they would have gotten it long ago. But the relatives did not do this. They took another route: They started demanding that the court rule that the airline was party—directly or indirectly—to the deaths of the passengers and, consequently, liable to pay far more compensation than $75,000. The next step will be a new judicial investigation into each of the dead passengers. It will be during these investigations—which, I was told, will take not less than two years—that the precise amount of compensation will be determined.

Yet, and IZVESTIYA has already written about this, the financial position of many of those whose relatives died that tragic night is truly desperate. If everything goes to plan, a commemoration ceremony to be attended by the relatives of the deceased should be held 1 September in the coastal waters around Moneron Island, where the Boeing 747 came down.

It should be, but... Many of them will most probably be unable to attend: The trip will be so expensive that they will be unable to afford it. The only people able to commemorate their relatives will be the well-off or those who receive help from charities.

Now to turn to the first part of the appeal court ruling. This is the key part. It follows from it that the Boeing crew knew they were off course but took no action to rectify the situation—such as turning back to Anchorage or checking their navigation instruments. The court, however, did not examine just why the deviation from the correct course occurred. Had it been preprogrammed or did it happen by chance?... But even the confirmation that the crew knew about the deviation is of enormous

importance: For all these years the airline has pretended that the aircraft was on its normal course and then suddenly "disappeared."

It seems to me that the appeal court ruling (it is only the ninth time in 60-odd years that a crew has been found guilty of a violation of its duties) will give new impetus to the attempts to finally discover **how this tragedy came about**.

One last point: In its ruling the appeal court referred to an investigation carried out by IZVESTIYA. Page 14 of the judicial documents mentions an interview given to our newspaper by Lieutenant Colonel Gennadiy Osipovich, the fighter pilot who downed the Boeing 747. It was mentioned as an example of how journalists had refuted the initial official version of events.

## U.S. Seen Pursuing 'Dual Policy' on USSR

*PM1305130191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 May 91 Union Edition p 4*

[Report by correspondent A. Shalnev: "Pushme-Pullyou Washington Style"]

[Text] New York—William Safire, observer for THE NEW YORK TIMES, who worked at the White House under Nixon and has excellent contacts in the present administration, reckons that President George Bush is like a "Pushme-Pullyou" in his policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. Things are said and done that are sometimes incompatible with one another, and even contradict one another, as is the case, apparently, with the "Pushme-Pullyou."

The most striking example one could cite to confirm Safire's mythological theory is, in my view, the way Bush made it clear a little over a week ago that the Soviet Union could not expect new agricultural credits from the United States and then, the other day, just as clearly announced that there would be aid, after all.

According to information from administration officials, there exist all manner of means of providing the USSR with assistance, including agricultural goods. But credits cannot, in fact, be provided, because this would contravene the provisions of a comparatively new law which effectively prohibits credits from being given to countries that are not credit-worthy.

But it is possible to circumvent the law without violating it. The options are as follows: the granting of food aid on a humanitarian basis. Although this would require, THE NEW YORK TIMES writes, that the Soviet Union be declared a "disaster area, which" the paper goes on, "would be rather difficult"; the allocation of credits through the export-import bank rather than the agriculture ministry, but no more than $300 million, which is one-fifth of the amount we asked for; the dispatch of a delegation of experts to the Soviet Union, who would suggest how we can modernize or reorganize the food distribution system; and the use of our gas and oil as a pledge—as a guarantee that we would pay back the credits.

There can be no doubt that the president, of course, already knew of these and a number of other options. But the White House head chose to to say only that there would be no agricultural credits for the Soviet Union. Now his pronouncements have become vastly more positive and overtly sympathetic—toward Moscow.

Moreover, having made it clear to us that the Kremlin would not receive any assistance whatsoever, the President took a series of countersteps. He received the top leaders of the three Baltic republics in the White House and announced through his representatives that a comparatively senior State Department official would soon be off on a tour of the Baltic capitals, in order, as Safire put it, to "show the American flag," and that another U.S. diplomat, a fluent speaker of Tajik, would be touring the Central Asian republics in the fall, acting there as a kind of traveling consul and to be followed, according to the weekly U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, by other traveling consuls.

Then came another step forward (or back?): There are clearer and clearer hints from the White House that the Soviet-American summit, initially planned for December, postponed until January, then until February, and finally postponed indefinitely, could be held either in June or in July.

The simplest explanation for all this would be to say that the administration is inconsistent, that it is hemming and hawing and just cannot decide what line to take. But the simplest way is not always the surest.

The line has been decided on and it is clearly discernible in what Washington says and does. And the fact that it is adjusted from time time does not change its essential character. The essence of it is that the White House has abandoned its exclusive gamble on Gorbachev and begun a gradual and very cautious shift of emphasis to the republics. According to a senior official, "the administration has acknowledged that Gorbachev is no longer synonymous with the Soviet Union."

Let us point out that all these arguments appeared in the U.S. press before we were apprised of the content of the recent telephone conversation between Gorbachev and Bush, a conversation which clarified many aspects of Soviet-American relations. Nonetheless, the emphasis in U.S. policy vis-a-vis our country is changing, changing gradually and very cautiously, although the fundamental decision—the decision on a "dual policy"—has already been taken in principle.

The gradual nature of it is understandable. Primarily because the White House has, as they would put it in America, "unfinished business" with the Kremlin. This applies chiefly to arms control, where, it seems, we are close to a solution both in the sphere of conventional

armaments and in the sphere of strategic nuclear armaments. In the next few days Chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Moiseyev will go to Washington to hold talks on actual disarmament issues. The situation is extremely unusual: Perhaps for the first time a representative of our military is not just a member of a disarmament delegation but is head of it. As I understand it, the Americans are entirely happy with this, because they are convinced that the diplomats have now done their stuff and that it has all now come to a halt at the Soviet military's door, so they must be talked to directly.

As we know, the progress that has been made very recently at the strategic arms talks is based on concessions by both sides. The proportions are not known, but I must point out one fact: The administration and Bush personally started talking about possible ways of aiding the Soviet Union, aside from granting agricultural credits, at approximately the same time as the contours of the disarmament compromises became clear. I am certainly not prepared to say what the cause is and what the effect is. But there is, in all likelihood, a connection, and, incidentally, Thomas Fridman [name as transliterated] wrote about it in THE NEW YORK TIMES: "...Apparently, a deal is being arranged, as a result of which Mr. Gorbachev would reassure Americans, who are concerned about arms control, and Mr. Bush would grant extra economic assistance, and they would both agree to hold a summit."

If so—and, to be frank, I have a few doubts—then Soviet-American relations are reaching a qualitatively new level, where there are very wide opportunities for obtaining concessions from us in a great variety of spheres. Until then, of course, our economic situation will remain dire.

But there is, so to speak, a positive aspect to our current weakness: Paradoxical though it may sound, the United States is almost as frightened of our weakness as it was, only recently, of our strength. What would happen if the Soviet Union were to actually collapse and disintegrate?

These fears might well explain why the U.S. President is not yet fully prepared to welcome the leaders of nationalist movements in our republics with open arms and is not prepared to support the demands that are being made with increasing stridency in Congress: demands for an enhanced status of relations between Washington and, for example, the Baltic republics.

The decision on a "dual policy," on a policy of orientation not only toward the center but also toward the republics has been taken, that is true. But it was taken with an eye more on the future than on the present. The administration is preparing itself for changes which many of its analysts believe are inevitable in the USSR. But I am not sure whether the administration is inclined to help make these changes happen immediately, right now, this minute.

...A "Pushme-Pullyou" has two heads. But only one body.

### Paper Indifferent on U.S. Envoy Replacement

*PM1405143191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 May 91 p 1*

[A. Vasilyev commentary on reprinted WASHINGTON POST report: "Djerejian Will Not Go to Moscow"]

[Text] It is in the blood of every normal reporter to want to cause a sensation and get himself talked about. And you can only rejoice when the whole world's mass media cite your articles. But what happened with the article entitled "Matlock Packs His Bags" (precisely this report is mentioned in THE WASHINGTON POST) is a special case.

It was published 20 April, and the telephones in the editorial office rang ceaselessly on 21 April and the subsequent days. People were mainly ringing from Armenia: Why did you write that the candidate to succeed Matlock is an Armenian? Why do you draw attention to this at all? Why are you interfering in U.S. internal affairs? And so forth.

This was the reaction of certain high-ranking staffers at the U.S. Embassy: In America it is not important what nationality you are, in America all are Americans. And the chief thing for an ambassador is competence.

It would be possible to agree with this if we were talking of the U.S. ambassador to Luxembourg or Trinidad and Tobago. But we are talking of the extraordinary and plenipotentiary representative of the United States in the Soviet Union—a state torn today by ethnic contradictions, where it is possible to pay with your life for belonging to any nationality. And if anyone knows this better than anyone else, it is the inhabitants of Armenia and Azerbaijan.

We certainly were not endeavoring to influence decisions of the White House or the U.S. Department of State by publishing the article "Matlock Packs His Bags": It is all the same to us whoever will be the ambassador. The chief thing is that he should be competent and there should be no war. Nor did we want to offend representatives of any nationality: We are identically sorry both for the Armenians and for the Azerbaijanis, who are killing each other. We simply reported the fact and endeavored to analyze it objectively. And the reaction in the White House indicates that the problem still exists and has not been invented by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA.

## China

### Jiang Zemin Gives Journalists Pre-Visit Briefing

*LD1505032591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0005 GMT 15 May 91*

[By TASS correspondents Vladimir Kashirov and Sergey Sorokin]

[Text] Beijing, 15 May (TASS)—Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee, left Beijing for a five-day official visit to the Soviet Union on a special airplane today. This visit is to reciprocate M.S. Gorbachev's visit to China in May 1989.

Before leaving, the general secretary of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee held a brief news conference for Chinese and foreign journalists at the airport.

"I am paying an official visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of M.S. Gorbachev, USSR president, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. It is a reciprocal visit to M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the PRC in May 1989. Since the normalization of relations between the two states and parties, our bilateral relations have been developing successfully in all spheres," Jian Zemin said.

The purpose of my visit is to promote the further development of good-neighborly relations between the PRC and the USSR on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence. I hope to hold fruitful talks with M.S. Gorbachev, USSR president, and to convey greetings and best wishes to the great Soviet people from the people of China, the Chinese leader noted.

"Thirty-six years have passed since I was on a training course at a Soviet motor factory in Moscow. After that I was in the Soviet capital in transit. I am very glad to make another visit to the Soviet Union after so many years," Jiang Zemin said, answering a question from Soviet journalists. I am confident, he stressed, that my visit will undoubtedly promote the further strengthening of friendly relations between our countries and peoples.

During his visit Jiang Zemin will be accompanied by Qin Jiwei, member of the Politburo of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee, member of the State Council, and PRC minister of national defense; Qian Qichen, member of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee, member of the State Council, and PRC foreign minister; Li Lanqing, candidate member of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee and PRC minister of foreign economic relations and trade; and other officials.

## Foreign Ministry Official on Jiang Zemin Visit

*LD1505081691 Moscow TASS in English 0753 GMT 15 May 91*

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Viktor Bezbrezhny and Sergei Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow May 15 TASS—General Secretary of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee, Chairman of the Military Council of the People's Republic of China Jiang Zemin will arrive here today for an official visit at the invitation of General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev.

No Chinese leader of such high standing has visited the USSR since 1957. However, this is already the second Soviet-Chinese summit over the past two years. The first one was held in May 1989, during Gorbachev's visit to the People's Republic of China. Describing that meeting, Deng Xiaoping then said that it put an end to past differences and paved the way for future relations. Jiang Zemin's current visit is being regarded in the same light.

"After the historical 1989 summit in Beijing, Soviet-Chinese relations were switched over to a stable and sound foundation. They are becoming increasingly strong and varied," a Soviet Foreign Ministry official told TASS. "The normal development of these relations showed convincingly that the principles laid down in the joint communique of May 1989 ensure the dynamic development of mutual relations in internal and external conditions that are not always sufficiently favourable.

"The current stage in the development of Soviet-Chinese relations may be described as a period when both countries are learning to live in conditions of mutual understanding and expanding scope of mutual activity. In practice, this finds expression in the expansion of cooperation practically in all areas—political, economic, scientific, technological, cultural, etc. Of key importance is the active political dialogue conducted at summit level."

During Jiang Zemin's visit and in the course of his meetings and talks in Moscow, the sides will exchange views on Perestroika and reforms in the two countries, on ways to further them. As to the strengthening and expansion of bilateral relations, they are expected to discuss contacts between the communist parties of the Soviet Union and China. Mikhail Gorbachev and Jiang Zemin are also expected to discuss key problems of the contemporary world.

## Gidaspov on Jiang Zemin Visit's Significance

*OW1505013891 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 2200 GMT 13 May 91*

[Interviews with Boris Gidaspov, CPSU Leningrad Oblast Committee first secretary and (Zhang Weichao), PRC consul general, by unidentified correspondents in Leningrad; date not given —recorded, Gidaspov remarks in Russian fading into Mandarin translation]

[Excerpt] [Gidaspov] I believe that Jiang Zemin's visit to the Soviet Union will be an important event for both our countries. During the visit, efforts will be made to solve the important question of developing Sino-Soviet relations. We shall try to make Jiang Zemin's visit to Leningrad meaningful.

Frank and constructive dialogues were held between the two sides when the CPSU Leningrad Oblast Committee delegation visited China. I believe we shall continue this kind of dialogue.

[Correspondent] China and the Soviet Union are undergoing important changes. What do you have to say about this?

[Gidaspov] Yes, China is carrying out very important political and economic reforms. I think the Chinese comrades have taken the correct path. We have witnessed tremendous progress by China in all areas. I think the major economic achievement is to make the people devote their energy to creating the fruits of their labor. This is a very valuable experience. Shanghai comrades' experience in developing the Pudong District for expansion of relations with foreign countries aroused my attention. The district will construct infrastructure facilities and energy projects first, before committing large amounts of money to opening facilities for foreign firms. This will yield tremendous results in developing cooperation. Soviet economists have a lot to think about and learn from this experience.

[Correspondent] Now, Leningrad is developing economic and trade relations with Shanghai and other Chinese cities. In future, in which spheres will Leningrad City and Oblast develop cooperation with China?

[Gidaspov] Leningrad produces power equipment. We have produced all kinds of complicated machinery for conventional and nuclear power plants. I think this represents science and technology. Cooperation in this sphere should be long-term. There is also a great demand for each other's services. I think this long-term cooperation will determine the nature of our relations with China in the economic field.

We should look ahead and start with work in this sphere. On the whole, I think there are great possibilities for cooperation. Of course, we should first understand each other's potential. Contacts, including those at the highest levels, will promote mutual understanding.

[Correspondent] Comrade (Zhang Weichao), two years ago, you granted an interview to a Radio Moscow reporter, in which you said that the most important thing was to implement the agreement and concept concluded and put forward by the Soviet and Chinese leaders during their summit in Beijing. In your opinion, what important work has been done in this respect in the past two years?

[(Zhang Weichao)] After Comrade Gorbachev's visit to China in May 1989, relations between the two countries were normalized. Two years have passed since the visit. During these years, exchanges between the USSR and China in various spheres have increased and expanded. For example, party and government exchanges between the two countries have increased. A delegation of the CPC Central Committee and that of the CPSU Central Committee have exchanged visits. Recently, local organizations of our two parties have also exchanged visits. A delegation of the Beijing municipal party committee, led by Comrade Li Ximing, visited the Soviet Union, and a delegation of the Leningrad Oblast party committee, led by Comrade Gidaspov visited Beijing, Shanghai, and other areas not long ago. These contacts at different levels have played an important role in developing Sino-Soviet relations, not to mention the exchange of visits by relevant leading comrades of our two countries. Since these visits, some progress has been made in the boundary talks between the two countries. Some agreements have been reached concerning the eastern sector of the Sino-Soviet border, and documents concerning the agreements will soon be signed. Progress has also been made in negotiations for the guiding principles of mutual reductions in armed forces and of confidence-building in the military sphere. These constitute progress made since the normalization of relations between China and the USSR. In other aspects, for example, the scope of cooperation between the two countries has enlarged and deepened. Some notable progress has been made in cooperation between the two parties and the government departments of the two countries, as well as in the speres of military, science, technology, culture, education, sports, economy, and trade. Let me cite a few examples. By the end of 1990, the volume of trade between China and the USSR had reached 5.23 billion Swiss francs. This is a very large figure. The volume of border trade between the two countries has also increased rapidly, approaching 1 billion Swiss francs in 1990. This is an impressive figure. Marked progress has been made in science and technology cooperation between the two countries. More than 30 departments, including the Academy of Sciences, have established direct ties with those of the Soviet Union. They have worked out plans for cooperation and reached agreement on hundreds of cooperative projects. According to the agreement, the two countries will cooperate in the fields of new materials, high technology, aerospace, and aviation. This is positive progress since the normalization of relations between the two countries. Moreover, the area of cooperation has also expanded. In addition to the big increase in governmental trade I have just mentioned, the volume of border trade has also risen sharply. Direct economic and trade relations have been established between various regions of China and the USSR, and mutual visits are very frequent, and relations between the two countries are very close. This is the positive progress made following the normalization of relations between the two countries. I think I can cite many more examples in this aspect, but, due to lack of time, I have only cited the above examples, which are sufficient to prove that China and the USSR have made progress in all fields since normalization of relations. Both sides are satisfied with the present condition of their relations.

[Correspondent] In recent years, April and May have an important period in relations between our two countries. Gorbachev visited China in May, and Premier Li Peng visited Moscow before May. A new Soviet-Chinese summit is to be held in Moscow this May. What is your view of this?

[(Zhang Weichao)] Yes, I think I'll make some comments in this connection. You have just mentioned that April and May are very important months in relations between

China and the USSR. Comrade Gorbachev's visit to China in May 1989 led to the normalization of relations between the two countries. During the visit, Comrade Deng Xiaoping said, "Let us put an end to the past and open up the future." Comrade Li Peng visited the Soviet Union in April and May of the following year, doing much work in opening up the future. His visit played the part of the motive force. In May this year, Comrade Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee and chairman of the PRC Central Military Commission, will pay a visit to the Soviet Union. His visit will mark the first by the highest-ranking party and state leader of China in the past 34 years. Of course, his upcoming visit has attracted the attention of the world. During the visit, both sides will exchange views on bilateral relations and international issues. The visit will mark the meeting between the highest-ranking leaders of the two countries. I think the visit will have great significance for increasing mutual understanding between the two countries, promoting the stable development of relations, and deepening and expanding cooperation in all fields. It is known to all that ours are two big socialist countries bordering each other. Both countries have played an important role in world affairs. Therefore, the upcoming visit by General Secretary Jiang is obviously an important event in the relations between China and the USSR. Moreover, it is significant internationally because the visit will have an important impact on safeguarding world peace and stability and on promoting the progress of mankind. I am very pleased to know that, in addition to Moscow, General Secretary Jiang will visit Leningrad. Now, the people here are (?cordially) looking forward to his visit. I hope, and I also believe, his visit will be crowned with success.

[Correspondent] Two years ago, you said that all Chinese diplomatic personnel in Leningrad should study the documents signed by the leaders of our two countries, vigorously promote the development of the relations between them, and implement the concluded agreements. What has the Chinese Consulate General done to develop the ties between China and the USSR and between Leningrad and Shanghai?

[(Zhang Weichao)] I have said before that, as consul general, my major mission, as well as that of my colleagues, is to promote the development of friendly relations between the two countries and cooperation in all fields between them. Specifically, our mission is to promote development of friendly relations between the people of Leningrad and those of relevant areas in China, and to promote cooperation between the Leningrad area and other areas in China, including Leningrad and Shanghai, the two friendly cities. The Consulate General has done its best in this respect. We have done what is within our capacity. The development of relations in various fields since the normalization of relations between the two countries has naturally promoted advancement of friendly relations and cooperation between Leningrad and Shanghai and between Leningrad and other areas of China. Specifically, I think relations between Leningrad and Shanghai are closer than those between Leningrad and other areas. When I say Leningrad, I mean Leningrad City and Leningrad Oblast. Now, cooperation and exchanges in the fields of science, technology, culture, sports, economy, and trade between Leningrad and Shanghai are developing gradually. [passage omitted].

### Jiang Zemin Visit Agenda Previewed

*OW1505080591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1811 GMT 14 May 91*

[From "Diplomatic Panorama"]

[Text] On May 15 the Chinese Communist Party's General Secretary and Chairman of China's Central Military Commission Jiang Zemin is arriving in Moscow on an official visit.

The visit is to last for five days.

May 15. Following an official reception ceremony in the Kremlin, the Chinese guest will have his first meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev. The day will end with a formal dinner at the Kremlin's Chamber of Facets [Hall of Mirrors].

May 16 begins with the laying down of wreaths at the Lenin Mausoleum, to be followed by a second round of talks in the Kremlin. It is planned to sign a set of Sino-Soviet documents at 11:30 a.m. some of which have been described in the May 13 DP [Diplomatic Panorama] issue. In the afternoon Jiang Zemin will meet with Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Anatoliy Lukyanov and Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov. In the evening the Chinese leader will take part in a function in his honour organized by the Society of Sino-Soviet Friendship.

May 17. In the morning Jiang Zemin is to visit the Moscow Likhachev Automobile Factory. Talks between the military, diplomatic, and trade agencies of the two countries are planned for the afternoon. At 4:30 p.m. the Chinese guest is to meet with the Soviet public at the Kremlin. The programme of the official visit will be completed with a press-conference at the Soviet Foreign Ministry's press-centre at around 6:00 p.m.

May 18, 19. The Chinese leader will stay in Leningrad for two days for a traditional cultural programme.

Some Soviet international news press analysts claim that Jiang Zemin's visit to the Soviet Union has certain peculiarities. Despite the previous statements by Soviet officials that Jiang Zemin will be received exclusively in the capacity of a leader from a neighbouring great country, the official programme of the Moscow talks includes meetings between the international departments of the Central Committee of the two communist parties. The plan includes a conversation between the Chinese leader and the local Communist Party leaders in Leningrad. Moreover, DP has information that Jiang

Zemin's visit to the Leningrad City Council was an eleventh-hour addition to the programme, and the Chinese leader will be accompanied to the Leningrad City Council by second secretary of the CPSU regional committee Yashin. DP failed to get any explanation as to who masterminded the programme.

Senior CPSU Central Committee staffer Andrey Denisov told DP that the Chinese delegation would include deputy chief of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee's International Department Zhu Liang. He will meet with his Soviet counterpart Valentin Falin and discuss the improvement of party ties. According to the Soviet Communist Party staffer, the main task is "to provide for party ties to be of maximum benefit."

But while doing so, the Soviet and China's political structures should be taken into consideration. It is known that, while remaining at the helm, the Soviet Communist Party does not any longer directly run the country's power structure. Speaking otherwise, the CPSU is no longer a "leading and directing" social force by law. On the contrary, China continues to adhere to the system that existed in the Soviet Union for many years and was known as a party and state system. The Chinese Communist Party is more than a political party, it is the core of the entire state power structure.

Asked how China viewed the changes in the Soviet political structure, Denisov said that the predominant feeling was that of concern as the Chinese leadership has a stake in having a stable and united neighbour.

According to the Soviet official, "the Chinese comrades have ambivalent feeling" about the forms and methods of transformations in the USSR. They approve of some things and are less than enthusiastic about others. Far from renouncing a real multi-party system or political pluralism, they, however, appear determined not to have them until some time in the future. "The Chinese comrades emphasize that stability is vitally essential," said Denisov. Stability is the key to everything, including economic reforms and their success, national development, the improvement of living standards and the preservation of a normal social climate. Due to this, they do not fully approve of the sequence of the steps the Soviet Union has been taking.

However, says Denisov, no ideological debates are expected during the upcoming visit. "Both we and our Chinese comraes already fell for this trap," says Denisov. In addition, neither this country nor China are willing to "sacrifice" the very weighty and important fruits of the normalisation to any far-fetched ideological concepts. Both countries treasure normal relations that are of paramount importance for both nations and states, according to the Soviet Communist Party expert.

## Rogachev Notes 'Mutual Understanding' With PRC

*LD1405153591 Moscow TASS in English 1511 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Sergey Kondratenko]

[Text] Moscow May 14 TASS—Soviet-Chinese relations in their totality have made much progress within the two years that have passed since Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to China, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev told TASS on the eve of the visit to the Soviet Union by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the Central Military Council of the PRC. Rogachev noted the growing confidence and mutual understanding between the two countries and a successful expansion of economic ties.

Regarding political relations between the Soviet Union and China, Rogachev said: "Our cooperation with China in the past two years confirmed that both sides firmly adhere to the new principles of mutual relations set out in the May 18, 1989 joint communique and intend to follow them unswervingly. This gives the reason to believe that alienation with China has ultimately receded to the past and enables us to be optimistic about future".

Regarding mutual reduction of armed forces and confidence- building in the military sphere on the border, Rogachev noted that negotiations on this matter will be an important element of relations in the military-political area in near future, help overcome military confrontation in the border region and indicate growing confidence between the two countries.

After concluding the April 24, 1990 inter-governmental agreement on the basic principles of reduction, the sides conducted three rounds of talks, concentrating their attention on discussing such an important set of questions as components of reductions.

During the latest round of negotiations it was decided to begin to draft a general agreement on the entire range of key questions of mutual reduction of armed forces in the border region.

Rogachev expressed the confidence that the meeting of top leaders of the two countries will give an additional impetus to the negotiations, first of all, on frontier issues and on the problem of mutual reduction of armed forces and on confidence-building in the military sphere in the Soviet-Chinese border region.

Much attention is given to the widening of commercial, economic, scientific and technical cooperation. The volume of trade between the two countries reached three billion roubles in 1990. Ties between separate republics, regions and cities of the USSR with Chinese provinces and cities are being vigorously developed. The volume of regional and border trade now amounts to nearly 700 million roubles. Rogachev noted the fact of China's

granting to the Soviet Union a commodities credit which he described as a real support for the Soviet Union at a difficult time.

Asked about prospects for interaction of the USSR and China in the Asia-Pacific region, Rogachev said that settlement of conflicts in Asia is a priority in the regional policy of both countries. The USSR and China virtually have similar approaches to the Korean problem and the Cambodian settlement. On the whole, both countries exert efforts to strengthen security in the Asia-Pacific region and to turn it into a zone of openness, cooperation and prosperity.

"The Soviet Union consistently holds the view that Taiwan is an inseparable part of China, one of the Chinese provinces", Rogachev said when asked about settlement of the Taiwan problem. "We have been and are invariably supporting Beijing's line at an early peaceful unification of Taiwan with the mainland."

Rogachev said that the Soviet Union suggested a multilateral dialogue in the Asia-Pacific region. It could be begun with a five-sided conference of the USSR, China, the U.S.A., India, and Japan. He proposed a conference of foreign ministers of the Asia-Pacific countries to be held in Vladivostok in 1993 and suggested preparations for a subsequent summit. Rogachev expressed the hope that the two countries will be acting together in all the affairs related to the destinies of the region.

## IZVESTIYA on Sino-U.S. Trade Links

*PM1405100791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 May 91 Union Edition p 4*

[Report by Yu. Savenkov: "What Will Washington Say in Reply to Beijing?"]

[Text] Beijing—"Trade and economic links are the basis of Sino-U.S. relations and we hope that the United States will resume most-favored nation status for China." Li Peng, the head of the Chinese Government, said during a meeting in Beijing with leaders of the national council for promoting U.S.-Chinese trade. Li Peng said that the Chinese policy of reforms and openness to the world will continue even if the United States deprives China of most-favored nation status.

And so, on the threshold of the day when President Bush is to take the final decision (that is to happen before 3 June) the exchanges of arguments and mutual claims among the politicians and businessmen in China and the United States have become more intensive. The recent visit to Beijing by U.S. Under Secretary of State R. Kimmitt, the "number three person in the State Department," as the news agencies describe him, attests to the acuteness of the situation. He is the highest ranking diplomat of those who have visited Beijing since the dramatic events of June 1989 and, analysts believe, his recommendations could become decisive for Bush.

Some observers have assessed Bush's recent decision to ban deliveries to China of U.S. components for a Chinese communications satellite as addressed to Congress, which is displeased with reports that China has delivered a nuclear reactor to Algeria and arms to Iraq and is planning to sell missiles to Pakistan. Observers have hinted that Bush is obviously inclined to resume most-favored nation status for Chinese exports and is using this ban to mitigate the congressmen's criticism in advance.

The U.S. congressmen are meanwhile submitting their own arguments. For instance, they are demanding the liberation of all political prisoners connected with the events around Tiananmen Square and are protesting the fact that China is allegedly using the labor of prisoners to produce goods which enter the U.S. market.

The Chinese arguments are utterly different. There are no political prisoners in Chinese prisons. And as for human rights, that is China's internal affair. In Beijing's view, Chinese citizens have appropriate rights and freedoms.

Recently a spokesman for the Chinese Foreign Ministry stated that China's foreign economic department has not given export licenses for goods produced in those places where convicts who are being reeducated through labor are working. Reports on the sale of arms to Iraq were described by the Foreign Ministry representative as "unfounded" and as for cooperation with Algeria in the field of nuclear energy, it is developing exclusively for peaceful purposes.

China is hinting that the United States is blatantly dilatory in the restoration of normal relations after the Tiananmen events and unless Washington restores most-favored nation status, a vacuum will arise which will be filled by other countries. It is not only China's imports and exports which will suffer but also the interests of U.S. consumers and businessmen.

As the Foreign Ministry spokesman stated at a press briefing, China will not accept any preliminary conditions to obtain most-favored nation status. The rapid growth of Sino-U.S. trade and economic relations is in the interests of both countries. Mutual efforts are needed for after all, as the Chinese saying has it, "you cannot clap with one hand."

## PRC Trade Official Views Joint Economic Ties

*PM1205141791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 May 91 Second Edition p 4*

["Our Interview" with Liu Zefu, chief of the PRC Ministry of Commerce's Department of Trade with the East European Countries, by correspondent B. Barakhta in Beijing; date not given: "On A Firm Footing"]

[Text] Beijing—The forthcoming visit to the Soviet Union by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, is attracting a great deal of attention

not only among the Chinese public, but among the world public as well. This is understandable: The complete normalization of relations between these two great powers has had a favorable impact on the international climate and promoted the development of good-neighborly relations between our countries and peoples.

In the period since M.S. Gorbachev's historic visit to Beijing, cooperation between the USSR and the PRC has been placed on a firm, mutually advantageous, and equal footing. A new summit now lies ahead. It will undoubtedly provide a powerful boost to Soviet-Chinese collaboration in all spheres.

Our conversation with Liu Zefu, chief of the PRC Ministry of Commerce's Department of Trade with the East European Countries, began with these important questions.

"Trade," Liu said, "strengthens mutual understanding and good-neighborly relations. In the past few years considerable progress has been achieved in Sino-Soviet relations. To a considerable extent this was promoted by the summits in Beijing in 1989 and during the visit to the Soviet Union by Li Peng, premier of the PRC State Council.

"Judge for yourself—in the past nine years trade turnover between the PRC and the USSR has increased several times over. Our trade and economic relations have been placed on a firm footing. In 1985 a long-term trade agreement was signed. The USSR supplies construction materials and fertilizers to China, and is helping to build a railroad in Xinjiang. For its part, the PRC exports consumer goods and foodstuffs to the Soviet Union.

"I would like to particularly emphasize that China and the Soviet Union are socialist states and neighbors with long-standing friendly relations. We have rich natural resources and many, as yet unexploited, opportunities and reserves.

"Last October a new trade agreement was concluded between our countries. We believe that this is a qualitatively new step in our trade and economic relations. We hope that this document will make it possible to set up joint ventures and develop direct ties and production sharing [kooperatsiya] between enterprises.

"We attach great importance to border trade, which has amounted to hundreds of millions of dollars over the past two years. In this sphere too relations are being based on an equal and mutually advantageous footing.

"Of course, there are major problems too. Disruption to deliveries and failure to fulfill contract commitments, for instance. The Chinese side is suffering losses because of this.

"We realize that complex processes are currently under way in the Soviet Union and that the entire economic system is being restructured. But we are confident that these are temporary difficulties and that they will definitely be overcome."

My interlocutor particularly stressed that the forthcoming visit to Moscow by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, will give new impetus to the development of trade and economic relations between the USSR and the PRC.

## Southeast Asia & Pacific

### Commentary Hails Do Muoi Visit to Moscow

*BK1405134591 Moscow Radio Moscow in Vietnamese 1300 GMT 13 May 91*

["Station Observer's Commentary," including recorded remarks by Do Muoi to an unidentified Radio Moscow correspondent]

[Text] Meetings between Soviet and Vietnamese leaders have become a traditional practice because they are aimed at strengthening the all-round cooperation between the two countries. It is absolutely necessary to hold such meetings because the Soviet Union and Vietnam—with a different pace of socioeconomic development—are striving to resolve pressing tasks and facing similar problems. They consider this an effort to help resolve the common task in the present era of swift changes, rapid development, and renovation in all aspects of daily life. This situation requires an extensive review of all issues pertaining to the Soviet-Vietnamese bilateral cooperation.

Comrades Gorbachev, Nguyen Van Linh, Pavlov, and Do Muoi all encourage the effort to develop the all-round Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation in the new situation and agree to strive to bring into full play the achievements in the relations of the two countries during the past several decades.

In an interview with Radio Moscow, comrade Do Muoi said:

[Begin recording] Generations of Vietnamese people will always remember and be grateful to the fraternal Soviet people, government, and party for their wholehearted support and assistance to the Vietnamese people in the struggle for national independence and unification as well as in socialist construction. I would like to mention here that efforts to consolidate and strengthen the traditional friendship and all-round cooperation with the Soviet Union are always our party's and state's policy and principle. It is a very important factor for the Vietnamese people in implementing national construction and defense. [end recording]

At their meeting in Moscow, both sides asserted positive changes in favor of the trade and economic relations between the two countries. Although goods exchange between the two countries this year has not exceeded $500 million, it is an encouraging sign. Vietnam has

begun paying part of its 10 billion rubles worth of debt to the Soviet Union. These are debts accumulated after the war while those provided by the Soviet Union during the war were already written off.

In their Moscow meeting, both sides discussed various concrete measures aimed at effectively implementing governmental level economic cooperation agreement for this year. Both sides decided to increase the volume of goods exhanges and the Soviet Union agreed to continue to provide assistance to 18 projects in Vietnam including the Hoa Binh hydroelectric power plant, the Chua Ve port container transportation terminal, the construction of bridges on railroads, and renovating the electric network in Hanoi, Haiphong, and Ho Chi Minh City. Both sides also attached much importance to direct contacts and economic cooperation among countries in the region and between the two countries. They also encouraged activities of joint venture enterprises. The Vung Tau-Con Dao Soviet-Vietnamese oil and gas joint venture is one of the biggest enterprises that can produce products worth $3 million [as heard] daily. The SOVICICO aquatic product enterprise is also making remarkable progress.

Dealing with results in the Soviet-Vietnamese econoomic cooperation, comrade Do Muoi, in the same interview said:

[Begin recording] I think that our two countries have much potential in expanding cooperation for our mutual interests. During my talks with the fraternal Soviet leaders, we firmly asserted our determination to enhance and consolidate the Soviet-Vietnamese traditional friendship and cooperation. We have decided on many important measures aimed at strengthening our cooperation especially in the economic, trade, and scientific-technological domains. We contended that effective implementation of this cooperation will contribute to enhancing the results of our bilateral agreement, thus satisfactorily serving the interests of our two peoples. [end recording]

Commenting on results of the meetings and talks between Soviet and Vietnamese leaders in Moscow, the Soviet press, radio and television stations have asserted new progress in the Soviet-Vietnamese relations.

## Near East & South Asia

### Bessmertrykh Holds Follow-Up Talks With Al-Asad

*LD1505090691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0805 GMT 15 May 91*

[Text] Damascus, 15 May [TASS]—A.A. Bessmertnykh's visit to Middle East countries ended on 14 May with a brief working visit to Damascus—the second in the seven days spent by the USSR foreign minister in the Middle East. He returned to Damascus because he needed to exchange views with the Syrian leadership, taking into account the results of the intensive talks he conducted on matters to set in motion the process of a Middle East settlement.

A.A. Bessmertnykh held a thorough conversation with Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad. A meeting was also held with Syrian Foreign Minister Faruq al-Shar'.

At the center of attention were specific aspects of a peace conference that would lead to a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict on the basis of UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. In particular, the form of UN participation in the conference and the possibility of and procedures for its resumption were examined.

The Syrian side gave a high assessment to the Soviet Union's diplomatic efforts, which are imbued with a desire for peace. The sides agree to continue contacts against the background of the dynamic situation now developing.

### Bessmertnykh Meets With 'Arafat in Geneva

*LD1405210391 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1930 GMT 14 May 91*

[Report by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov in Geneva]

[Text] At the final stage of his Middle East mission, USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh has met Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO], in Geneva. As the talks between Baker and Bessmertnykh in Tel Aviv and the Arab capitals show, there are serious differences between Israel and the Arab countries on the fundamental questions of a Middle East settlement, above all on the Palestinian problem.

Thus, the Israeli Government continues to say no the UN's participation in an international conference, a dialogue with the PLO, and discussion of the question of returning the occupied Palestinian territories. The Arab countries, and Syria most of all, think that the settlement process will only get off the ground if Tel Aviv abandons its intransigent position and seeks a compromise. The results of the multilateral talks in the Middle Eastern capitals do not as yet inspire optimism, the Geneva newspapers stress.

Today a new link is being added to these talks—the Geneva meeting between Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and Yasir 'Arafat. The Palestinian leadership's position during the Persian Gulf conflict has weakened the PLO's international influence, but the fate of the Palestinian people and the participation of its representatives in a Middle East settlement remain key questions, and, without a fair resolution of them, there can be no peace in the Middle East. That is well understood in Moscow, in Washington, and in the European capitals.

### TASS Reports Meeting

*LD1505080191 Moscow TASS in English 0748 GMT 15 May 91*

[By TASS correspondents Boris Shabayev and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Geneva May 15 TASS—A meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and Chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organisation's Executive Committee Yasir 'Arafat ended here last night. It focused on the problem of promoting mutual exchanges of views on the Palestinian issue, which holds central place in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The Palestinian side stressed that it regarded as very reassuring the joint Soviet-American effort to settle the Middle East problem.

Replying to correspondents after the meeting, Bessmertnykh noted that the talks were mainly devoted to the search for ways "to ensure most productively the national interests of the Palestinian people".

For his part, 'Arafat expressed profound gratitude to the Soviet Union for its invariable support to the just cause of the Palestinian people.

### Bessmertnykh: Conference Chances 'Increasing'

*PM1505110591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 May 91 Union Edition p 5*

[Report by correspondent D. Velikiy under the general heading "Complex Road to Peace Conference"]

[Text] Cairo—Can it be said that there is light at the end of the tunnel as regards the Near East settlement situation? This question was put to Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh following his meeting with U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker in Cairo.

"I must say," the Soviet minister replied, "that our talks on the Near East have, happily, already left the tunnel, and we are working on quite a wide plateau. The chances of a peace conference being held are increasing. The number of problems dividing the sides is falling. Progress continues, and it provides a basis for hope."

Yet it needs to be noted, J. Baker stated for his part, that despite the agreements reached on a number of issues there are still major problems that remain to be settled. These include, for instance, the differences in the Israeli and Syrian Government positions regarding the presence of UN representatives at the proposed conference. Nor is there any united opinion about whether this should be a one-time meeting, or whether there should be several such meetings. But whatever happens, the United States and the USSR have agreed to work together and in conjunction with a view to convening a peace conference.

The question of the situation prevailing in northern Iraq in the light of the provision of humanitarian aid to the Kurds and the world community's role in this process also figured in the Cairo meeting between Baker and Bessmertnykh.

Following the Cairo meeting the Soviet minister set off for Saudi Arabia, while the U.S. secretary of state left for Jordan and Israel.

### Bessmertnykh, Baker Talks Reviewed

*LD1405194791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 14 May 91*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A meeting has taken place in Cairo between USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. Afterward, the two ministers held a news conference. Answering a question from our correspondent as to whether the positions of the sides regarding the conflict in the Near East are coming closer together, James Baker said in part:

[Begin recording] [Baker in English with superimposed Russian translation] Well, I have commented on that by saying that there are a number of problems on which a considerable degree of agreement has been achieved. There are also a number of others on which there is still no agreement. There are substantial disagreements, for instance, between Syria and Israel on UN participation in the peace conference, and also on whether this conference will be a one-time event, or whether it will play the role of a permanent forum meeting at intervals. We shall go on working to bring our positions closer.

[Bessmertnykh] I have to say that our talks on the Near East (?have covered rather a lot of ground) and the possibilities of holding a conference such as we are speaking of are increasing. The number of problems dividing the sides is being reduced, so that the main thing I would like to remark on in this connection is that nothing has stopped and the rapprochement continues. The very fact of a rapprochement gives grounds for hope. [end recording]

### Bessmertnykh Remarks in Riyadh, Damascus Viewed

*LD1405160991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1453 GMT 14 May 91*

*[By TASS correspondents Vadim Shchennikov and Georgiy Shmelev]*

[Text] Damascus, 14 May (TASS)—I have already noted and I want once more to stress that we consider the present visit to Riyadh by USSR Foreign Affairs Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh to be a historic move in Saudi-Soviet relations, stated Saudi Arabian Foreign Minister Sa'ud al-Faysal. In a conversation with journalists at the airport today, before the Soviet delegation left Riyadh for Damascus, he noted that during the talks the sides discussed the most varied aspects of mutual cooperation,

first and foremost in the trade and economic sphere. Despite the fact that diplomatic relations between our countries were only recently restored, bilateral ties are developing very successfully. He pointed out that during the conversations understanding was also achieved on a Near East settlement.

Al-Faysal stressed that Saudi Arabia highly appraises the USSR position in resolving conflicts in the Persian Gulf region. We support the efforts that the USSR and the United States are making today to overcome the Near East crisis and to convene a peace conference on the Near East, he said.

Speaking to correspondents, A.A. Bessmertnykh expressed deep satisfaction with the results of the Riyadh talks with King Fahd and his Saudi colleague. We have discovered a great deal that is common in the approaches of the sides toward the resolution of the problem of a settlement in the region, the head of the Soviet foreign policy department noted. The question of bilateral Soviet-Saudi ties was discussed in great detail, A.A. Bessmertnykh said. My visit is the first by a USSR foreign minister to Saudi Arabia in the whole history of our relations. It has been decided to hold regular bilateral consultations and to facilitate, at all levels, a dynamic development of cooperation between our countries. He also stated that he has invited Sa'ud al-Faysal, Saudi Arabia's foreign minister, to visit the Soviet Union at a time convenient to him.

USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh, completing his working trip to Near East countries, today made a brief stop-over in Damascus to meet Hafiz al-Asad, president of Syria. At the Damascus International Airport, he stated that he returned to Damascus to exchange views with the Syrian leadership about the results of his talks with the leaders of Jordan, Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia and also of his two meetings in Cairo with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. In the process of the Arab-Israeli settlement, A.A. Bessmertnykh stressed, Syria plays the key role and that is why we attach special significance to our consultations with the head of that state. The USSR foreign minister pointed out that as far as the convocation of a conference on the Near East is concerned, there exist many viewpoints and there are differences, as has transpired from the consultations that have taken place. In particular, he said, these differences concern the role of the United Nations and the duration of a peace conference. The task now is to continue efforts to step up the peace process and to try to find ways to tackle controversial issues. A meeting between USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh and Faruq al-Shar', his Syrian counterpart, took place in Damascus today. They exchanged views on the current situation in the matter of a Near East settlement in light of the results of the trip by the head of Soviet diplomacy to the countries of the region.

## Mideast Opinions on Bessmertnykh Tour Viewed

*LD1405194291 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1830 GMT 14 May 91*

[Report by correspondent Kim Gerasimov in Cairo]

[Text] If one were to try and sum up in one word the Arab reaction to the Soviet foreign minister's trip, without exaggeration on my part and without in any way stretching the point, that word would be that they welcome it. Both here in Cairo and throughout the Arab world as a whole, in the widest possible circles as far as political orientation is concerned, they have been speaking with growing bitterness in recent years about our country's withdrawal from active participation in the process of the search for an all-embracing peace settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. At least, that is precisely how our position was viewed here in the Middle East. They put this down to well-known reasons: first and foremost our own internal difficulties. And now, in commenting upon Aleksandr Bessmertnykh's tour of the Middle East, the local press writes that the Soviet Union has rehabilitated itself as a great power, at least as far as the Middle East is concerned.

To what do they draw particular attention here? First of all, to the statement by Comrade Bessmertnykh about Israel's demands that diplomatic relations be restored between it and our country as a condition for the Soviet Union's participation in the Middle East peace process. As we know, the Soviet minister stated that we reject any prior conditions. And second, the Soviet minister's statement that he cannot accept a situation in which a peace conference on the Middle East would work under conditions where the establishment of Israeli settlements on the occupied lands is continuing. Both these points, both these statements, are of course welcomed here. But at the same time it is also noted that all the talks that Bessmertnykh has held in the Middle East have been conducted in a constructive spirit and a spirit of goodwill. Active striving on the part of the Soviet Union to find real ways toward a peaceful and just settlement of the Middle East conflict has been demonstrated in his meetings with Arab leaders and also with the Israeli leadership and in his conversations with U.S. Secretary of State Baker.

One circumstance is noted here as being very important and qualitatively new as far as Middle East affairs are concerned: The fact that the two superpowers, the USSR and the United States, are now acting here not from positions of mutual confrontation but from positions of cooperation in the quest for peace. Irrespective of the large number of obstacles that still lie on the road to peace in the region, it is precisely in this cooperation that they see one of the most important conditions for resolving the oldest of the regional conflicts that exist in the world today.

### Foreign Ministry Issues Statement on Afghanistan

*LD1405121491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1050 GMT 14 May 91*

["USSR Foreign Ministry Spokesman's Statement on Afghanistan"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 15 May (TASS)—Following is the text of a statement by a spokesman of the USSR Foreign Ministry:

In accordance with the Geneva agreements, the homecoming of the Soviet troop contingent from Afghanistan began three years ago on 15 May. The withdrawal of Soviet troops, carried out precisely on schedule and within the set deadlines, demonstrated once again the Soviet Union's conscientious and sincere attitude in observing the its pledges and respecting the international documents bearing its signature.

The Government of the Republic of Afghanistan has acted in a similar way, not only observing strictly and unconditionally the articles and provisions of the noninterference agreements signed with Pakistan, but also in creating the necessary conditions for the return of Afghan refugees. All of this has been supplemented by flexible and constructive proposals directed toward national reconciliation and a political solution to the conflict in Afghanistan. Such proposals have been put forth by the Afghan leadership as well as the Soviet side which is a guarantor of the Geneva agreements. Thus, the necessary conditions for ending the fratricidal war and restoring peace on Afghanistan's long-suffering soil have been created. In the wake of the signing of the Geneva agreements in April 1988, chances for a successful solution have become realistic.

Regrettably, these accords and the specific steps subsequently taken by Kabul and Moscow have been unable to end the bloodshed in Afghanistan, primarily because of the obstructionist policy of forces that have become involved in the Afghan conflict: first and foremost, Pakistan. Although the withdrawal of the Soviet troops was completed long ago, the interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs and the extensive assistance for the armed Afghan opposition from Pakistan's territory have not only not ceased, but are tending to increase. An example of this are the recent events in Khowst, which demonstrated direct military support for the Afghan "Mojahedin" on the part of Pakistani Armed Forces.

Through the active efforts of Afghanistan, the USSR, Iran, and the United States and with the broad assistance of the United Nations, much has been done to find a political solution in Afghanistan since the Soviet troop withdrawal. Moreover, an international consensus regarding the fundamental principles of such a settlement has begun to take shape.

The Soviet Union and the Republic of Afghanistan start from the premise that any settlement that can achieved through an internal political dialogue within Afghanistan should be based on the renunciation of the use of force, on a sensible and fair compromise, consideration of the actual situation, and on a balancing the opposing sides' interests. In practice, everyone—with the exception of the most extremist section of the "Peshawar Seven," which is becoming ever increasingly isolated from the sensible section of the Afghan political opposition—now recognizes that there is no alternative to a political solution.

In the current situation, a sober approach to the Afghan problem, devoid of any kind of ambitions, is needed as never before. A double standard is not merely out of place here, it is damaging and can hamper a qualitative breakthrough in the Afghan settlement because it can freeze the assets that have been recently built up during many-sided contacts on the Afghan problem. Such a breakthrough is quite realistic providing that the Afghan opposition and its supporters abandon ultimatums—accompanied by strong-arm methods—that are calling for the Afghan Government's departure from the political arena.

In connection with this, a great deal depends on the countries that support the opposition and with which the latter must reckon. If they were to succeed in prompting the opposition to desist from escalating military activities in favor of a peaceful dialogue, a breakthrough could be achieved. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it continues to be ready to do everything possible in cooperation with the Afghan side to achiveve such settlement.

We cherish as sacred the memory of the soldiers and officers who perished on Afghan soil. The USSR Foreign Ministry, together with other Soviet official departments, is making every effort to shed light on the fate of Soviet servicemen who are missing in Afghanistan, and to liberate those who ended as captives in the hands of the Afghan armed opposition. Their fate is of profound concern to all Soviet people. We hope that the entire world community will give assistance and support to resolve this humanitarian problem.

## West Europe

### CPSU Delegation Attends German CP Congress

#### Departs Moscow 9 May

*LD0905160291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1030 GMT 9 May 91*

[Text] Moscow, 9 May (TASS)—At the invitation of the board of the German Communist Party, a CPSU delegation headed by Yuriy Prokofyev, first secretary of the CPSU Moscow City Committee and member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, left Moscow for the FRG today to take part in the 11th German Communist Party congress.

## CPSU Message to Congress

*PM0905150591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 May 91 Second Edition p 4*

[Undated message from CPSU Central Committee Secretariat to 11th German Communist Party Congress]

[Text] To the 11th German Communist Party Congress

We send comradely greetings to the participants in the 11th German Communist Party Congress and all members and friends of the German Communist Party.

Reaffirming the CPSU's internationalist solidarity with the German Communists, we wish the congress successful work and constructive decisions in the interests of the working people and the rallying of the country's left-wing and democratic forces.

[Signed] CPSU Central Committee Secretariat

## Prokofyev Meets SPD Official

*LD1005213491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1410 GMT 10 May 91*

[TASS correspondents Nikolay Kalintsev and Sergey Sosnovskiy]

[Text] Bonn, 10 May (TASS)—Yuriy Prokofyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU City Committee, who is in Bonn, has met with Norbert Gansel, deputy chairman of the Social-Democratic [SPD] faction in the German Bundestag, within the framework of the development of inter-party links between the CPSU and the German SPD. A thorough exchange of opinions took place on the current domestic political situations in the USSR and in unified Germany, and on the prospects for the development of relations between the two countries and parties.

N. Gansel, having demonstrated considerable interest in the changes taking place in the USSR, expressed the conviction that despite the considerable difficulties, the process of political and economic reforms is continuing. He noted that the country's major political parties, including naturally the Social Democrats, express the hope that perestroyka will be successful and furthermore are also prepared to offer all possible support to these processes.

In this context, N. Gansel stressed that the German SPD is prepared to share its many years of experience of parliamentary work with Soviet legislators. The German SPD faction in particular would be prepared to receive a group of deputies from the Soviet Union on a visit to familiarize themselves with the working of the German parliament, and would assume responsibility for all expenses during their stay in the FRG.

## Prokofyev Addresses Congress

*LD1105145191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1304 GMT 11 May 91*

[By TASS correspondents Nikolay Kalintsev and Sergey Sosnovskiy]

[Text] Bonn, 11 May (TASS)—Within the framework of the 11th Congress of the German Communist Party there was an international discussion forum attended by representatives of more than 20 foreign communist parties and national liberation movements who are present at the congress.

Speaking at it, Yuriy Prokofyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow City CPSU Committee, thanked the German Communists for the opportunity provided to attend their congress. This forum, he said, is taking place at a difficult time for the whole communist and working-class movement, and especially for the countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. What is taking place there is not a crisis of the socialist idea, but the result of mistakes that we committed on the way toward socialism. One cannot, however, speak only about mistakes, since a very great deal was accomplished on the way. The changes that capitalism too has undergone and the creation in the West of a system of social protection—all this occurred not without the influence of real socialism and the communist and working-class movement.

Today, Yuriy Prokofyev continued, some comrades are asking whether we need internationalism. We undoubtedly do. The invitation to the German Communist Party Congress of the representatives of foreign communist parties is confirmation of this. This also applies to the delegation of the CPSU, which can compare your problems with ours.

Our society and all the Soviet Union are now in a serious economic crisis, Yuriy Prokofyev said. This crisis extends both to politics and to ethics. This can also be explained, specifically, by the fact that the party that was the ruling and guiding force of society did not measure up in its operations to the processes that were taking place in that society. Above all, we had to change our economic structures. The system that existed was essential in the Twenties and during the war years. It had to be transformed later, since it no longer ensured the production of the necessary material benefits for people. Any society develops, and the party that is not dogmatic and is attached to the principles of the dialectic had to react to the changes in society. Unfortunately, we did not do that in time. The processes that are taking place in our country and in our party are similar to those that have been discussed at your congress. The party is not uniform now. There are people who, fearing difficulties and mistakes, are now prepared to allow the restoration of capitalism, to reform the party and to make it a purely social-democratic one.

There are people, Yuriy Prokofyev said, who believe that there is no need to change anything at all and who urge us to act in accordance with principles and postulates that held good back at the beginning of the century. But most Soviet communists are striving to find ways out of this difficult crisis situation to build a socialist society rather than the state socialism that we have achieved. What is needed is a socialism that is in tune with man's aspirations and requirements. I can assure you that it is not at all a simple matter to be a communist in Moscow today or in the USSR in general, because the blame for all the mistakes of the past, the present, and already the years of perestroyka is now pinned on the CPSU. At the 28th CPSU Congress we managed to save the party from splitting, and I am sure that we will be able to find solutions that will enable party unity to be preserved in the future. We are now working on a new party program which, I am convinced, will make it possible to unite around it not only communists, but also a considerable part of society. It will be adopted at a party conference or at an extraordinary CPSU congress at the end of this year.

This, the speaker said, is no easy matter, since we have in our party a variety of opinions no less than your congress delegates have. We believe that no one must be alienated. A way must be found that the majority can accept. The elaboration of theoretical problems is necessary, but practical matters must not be forgotten either. All of us and our party lost quite a lot last year by elucidating our political person and drawing up the new rules. At that very time the party's standing among the people was falling. Without in any way belittling the importance of theory, I should like to support those delegates at your congress who have spoken about practical deeds. If the party is transformed into a discussion club, if it does not resolve specific socioeconomic problems and does not resolve issues that concern the people, then such a party is doomed to extinction.

I want to wish you wholeheartedly success in surmounting the difficulties that the Communist Party and the working-class movement in united Germany are encountering, Yuriy Prokofyev emphasized.

The congress discussion forum was also addressed by representatives of the communist and workers' parties of Cuba, Vietnam, Luxembourg, Austria, and a number of other countries.

### Delegation Departs 14 May

*LD1505223991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1156 GMT 14 May 91*

[Text] Bonn, 14 May (TASS)—The CPSU delegation headed by Yuriy Prokofyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee's Politburo and first secretary of the CPSU's Moscow City Committee, which took part in the 11th congress of the German Communist Party held in Bonn between 10 and 12 May, left for Moscow today.

### Soviet Citizen Sentenced for Spying in Italy

*PM1505092291 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 May 91 p 1*

[A. Korzun report: "Passion for Spying; He Wanted To Know Everything"]

[Text] The court met in the Italian city of Turin on 9 May in a case of spying for the Soviet Union. Two Italian citizens and Viktor Dimitriyev, a staffer with the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, had charges brought against them.

As the Italian news agency ANSA reports, in the course of the numerous hearings at the trial, which began back in February of this year, it was proved that two former staffers of the computer company Olivetti, Maria Antonietta Valente and Roberto Mariotti, who is still in hiding, attempted to sell secret documents to Viktor Dmitriyevich. In particular, in July of last year the Italian secret service arrested Valente, and these documents were found in her car. The documents, according to information in our possession, were connected with a computer information protection system used by NATO.

However, USSR citizen Viktor Dimitriyev said that the court had no substantive evidence of his guilt. Dimitriyev considers that he has been a "victim of provocation" on the part of some person trying to advance his position in the Italian secret service at Dimitriyev's expense.

Nevertheless, the court fixed the punishment: Viktor Dimitriyev and Maria Antonietta Valente will serve a sentence of four years each, and their accomplice Roberto Mariotti will serve six years.

Unfortunately, we were unable to obtain more detailed information from Soviet sources—we received the reply from the department involved and the USSR KGB that it was their day off yesterday...

## Latin America & Caribbean

### U.S. 'Propaganda,' Nicaraguan Unrest Linked

*91UF0730A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 May 91 Second Edition p 5*

[Report by correspondent V. Listov: "The Tracks Lead North; Attempt on the Life of V. Chamorro: What Lies Behind It?"]

[Text] Mexico, May—The name of the Hotel Intercontinental in Managua, near which Enrique Bermudez, the leader of the Nicaraguan Contras, was killed in February, can once again be seen in Latin American newspapers. A series of submachine gun rounds was heard in the evening of 27 April against the front the restaurant, where Nicaraguan President V. Chamorro was attending her niece's wedding. Several bullets entered the festive

lounge, wounding two participants in the festivities. That same night terrorists shot up a military base in the southern zone of the capital and, two days later, the police barracks on the Northern Highway.

Soon after, a Government Ministry spokesman informed journalists that the vehicle which had been used at the time of the shooting at the hotel had been found (it belonged to Maximino Rodriguez Martinez—a former Contra chief with the name of "Commandante Vilmer") and that one Carlos Garcia, known among the Contras as "Chino-85," had been arrested on suspicion of involvement in the attempt on the life of V. Chamorro....

It is obvious that "Commandante Vilmer," "Chino-85," and their accomplices were merely the executors of the terrorist action. Government Minister Carlos Hurtado declared that it was a question of "a real attempt on the country's stability" and accused "a group of dissident extremists." But who the inspiration behind and organizer of the attempt was remains an open question. And another important question: Why did the shots that rang out in Managua coincide with armed protests in the northern departments of Jinotega and Matagalpa of groups of Contras threatening once again to unleash civil war?

A year has elapsed since the moment when V. Chamorro assumed the presidency of the republic. Despite the continuing problems and difficulties, the first year of V. Chamorro's government has been characterized, in my view, by two main features: first, peace, established by way of the disarming of more than 20,000 Contras and a reduction in the Sandinist People's Army, and, second, national reconciliation, which, although not conclusive, has been quite stable and was achieved thanks to steps geared to the country's democratization and the assurance of political pluralism. Overcoming the profound economic crisis, however, born of a decade of armed struggle is no easy task. And V. Chamorro's government should be given its due: It is making considerable efforts to extricate the country from the crisis. The implementation of a strict plan of economic stabilization began in March, and the national currency has been devalued five times. In April the legislature approved laws on the attraction of foreign investment and the creation of private banks, and a bill on the privatization of approximately 400 state-owned enterprises is being studied.

The country's international positions are strengthening also. An agreement was signed recently according to which the Venezuelan State Company will assist Nicaragua in the exploration of the oil deposits on its territory and also in the training of technicians in the field of petroleum enterprise management. An understanding was reached in the course of V. Chamorro's recent Washington visit on the United States granting Managua financial assistance.

But all this is merely the visible canvas of events. Relations between Nicaragua and the United States, meanwhile, are far from cloudless. Washington is not concealing its dissatisfaction with Managua's position in respect of the leaders of the Salvadoran insurgents: Despite the United States' repeated protests, they remain in Nicaragua. Nor is Washington disposed to welcome the rapprochement of Nicaragua and Venezuela reflected in the above- mentioned "petroleum agreement." Nor, of course, can Washington be delighted by the fact that the Sandinistas are, as before, heading Nicaragua's armed forces.

I believe that the investigation of the Bermudez assassination could also cause the U.S. special services considerable trouble, which they would certainly like to avoid. I will confine myself merely to a few brushstrokes. Shortly after the assassination of Bermudez, Nicaragua's Interior Ministry requested that the FBI establish the identities of two Americans who at daybreak on the day after the Bermudez assassination hastily checked out of the Hotel Intercontinental and left for the United States. Also surprising is the fact that a few hours after the assassination of Bermudez the telephone rang in his mother's apartment in Miami. An unknown person announced that her son had been killed. An investigation showed that no one had called this number from Nicaragua. Finally, the Interior Ministry called the FBI's attention to the fact that, according to the findings of medical personnel from Miami, the bullet fired at Bermudez entered at an acute angle, from which it follows that the shot was fired from above, that is, from a hotel room, possibly. Although almost three months have elapsed since the time of the Nicaraguan Interior Ministry's appeal, the FBI, to judge by the press, has made no response.

Political commentators are observing in this connection that there are circles in the United States that are unhappy with the "patience" being displayed by the White House in respect of the V. Chamorro government. They and the Nicaraguan counterrevolutionary emigres also dislike it all: the political pluralism, the V. Chamorro government's reliance on the Sandinista People's Army, which is serving as a bastion of Nicaraguan statehood and national sovereignty (these circles would like to see at the head of the army "their own people"—the former Contra bosses) and, finally, the fact that Vice President Virgilio Godoy, leader of the Nicaraguan ultra- right, is being assigned secondary roles. This, as the press observes, is the main reason for the political demarches, armed protests, and acts of terrorism, including the attempted assassination of President V. Chamorro, being staged by the right.

Attempts to preserve the Contras as a political force had been made earlier also. But they were then seen as a counterweight to the Sandinistas. Now, however, such efforts have acquired a different thrust—against the V. Chamorro government. Armed Contra groups, which have come to call themselves "national salvation brigades," once again showed up in the north of the country at the start of April. They are carrying out raids on peasant cooperatives, taking hostages, and setting up roadblocks, declaring that their aim is a resumption of

the armed struggle "on the principles proclaimed by Colonel Bermudez." The new Contra bosses are making no secret of their plans: to demand the resignation of V. Chamorro and transfer power to Vice President Godoy.

It has become known in recent days that the chiefs of the so- called "northern front" are attempting to enlist on their side the leaders of other counterrevolutionary groupings who once formed the "central" and "southern" fronts and also members of the Yatama Misquito Indian organization. A candidate for the role of political leader of the Contras in the place of the slain Bermudez is being sought at the same time. In this connection the press is insistently emphasizing the "obvious connection" between Vice President Godoy and the armed groups in the north of the country.

But this is what is significant. Observers have called attention not only to Godoy's recent trip to Miami, when he met with Nicaraguan emigre leaders, but also to the fact that the stimulation of the ultra-right forces in Nicaragua, including the actions of the armed Contras in the north and the acts of terrorism in the capital, have coincided in time with a propaganda wave in the United States aimed against the V. Chamorro government. It has reached the point of THE LOS ANGELES TIMES accusing the Nicaraguan Government of "moral and political disintegration" and even of following the political traditions of Somoza.

"Nicaragua is in a serious and extremely dangerous situation" is how Luis Carrion, a leader of the Sandinista National Liberation Front, describes the atmosphere taking shape in the country.

## Supreme Soviet

### Supreme Soviet Changes Military Service Law

*LD1405223791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2120 GMT 14 May 91*

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The country's Supreme Soviet has put into effect a law on amendments to the USSR law on universal military duty, expecting the institution of a two-year term of active service in the navy and one year for soldiers, sailors, sergeants and sergeant majors with higher education. The change to the new term of service is planned to be made in 1991-92. A resolution has also been adopted on the holding of an experiment in the USSR Defense Ministry in recruiting, on a voluntary basis by contract, servicemen on active military service to become sailors and naval petty officers.

### Deputies Meet in Committees 14 May

*LD1405095591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0700 GMT 14 May 91*

[Text] The deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet are working in committees and commissions today. They are continuing to prepare the draft laws that are intended to be adopted at this session.

### Sharin Discusses Security Law 13 May

*LD1405094391 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 1847 GMT 13 May 91*

[Report by Leonid Sharin, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Defense and State Security Committee, to the USSR Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow on 13 May; from the "USSR Supreme Soviet Session" program—recorded]

[Excerpts] Numerous written appeals came in to the Defense and State Security Committee from a number of local Soviets of people's deputies, from individual people's deputies at various levels, and from many citizens, which voiced profound concern over the situation that has developed in the country. They expressed demands that lawfulness, discipline, and law and order be restored in the country, and that the legal basis of the activity of the law-enforcement bodies and especially of the state security bodies be strengthened, and a request that the law on these bodies be adopted as soon as possible. [passage omitted]

On the whole, it should be said that nearly all remarks and proposals either fully or in some specific part have been reflected in the draft submitted for your examination. During the first reading, certain people's deputies remarked that the draft law required revision regarding strengthening guarantees of the rights and freedoms of the individual and his protection from unlawful interference in his private life and guarantees against possible violation of his interests. It was proposed that the defense of human rights should be given priority in the very first article. [passage omitted]

We should probably ultimately proceed from the status and purpose of the state security bodies and the specific nature of their activity; furthermore, the defense of human rights, though it is an important function of the state security bodies, probably cannot be its main function. You have to agree that this is not the purpose for which such bodies are set up throughout the world. The activity of these bodies is aimed, first and foremost, all the same, at defending state security. The view seems fair of those people's deputies and legal specialists who believe that to burden down this draft excessively with norms for the defense of human rights would merely increase the populist nature of this law. It is another matter that the activity of the state security bodies should be carried out under the strict observance of human rights and it has to be said here that the defense of human rights, and respect for the individual runs clearly through many of the draft law's provisions. [passage omitted]

Nevertheless, as dissatisfaction was expressed, the draft has now formulated anew an article specially devoted to this problem. It is called: Guarantees of observance of the rights and freedoms of citizens in the activity of the state security bodies. We believe that this concentrates all the main components of these guarantees. This is Article 4. [passage omitted] The article has an additional clause stating that at the demand of a citizen, an explanation of the restriction of rights and freedoms has to be given by the state security bodies in written form. [passage omitted]

Once again, the question has been raised of the depoliticization of the state security bodies. [passage omitted] What can be said about this? First of all, one should probably look at the law we recently adopted on public associations. After all, this law prohibits neither the activity of public associations in state bodies and institutions, nor their employees', including servicemen and other employees of the law-enforcement bodies, membership in any political party. With this in mind, any ban, especially through the force of law, on belonging or not belonging to political parties, no matter who is concerned, would today be a direct violation of human rights. So, the draft of the law under examination reproduces a norm established in Article 16 of the Law on Public Associations. [passage omitted]

All remarks and proposals were carefully weighed and taken into account to one degree or another. However there were some which for a number of objective reasons could not be adopted. [passage omitted]

In conclusion, on behalf of the two committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet, I propose that this law be adopted as a whole and that article-by-article discussion of it be initiated in accordance with the established procedure.

## Political & Social

### Aide Views Gorbachev-Yeltsin Republics Formula

*LD1405182191 Moscow TASS in English 1810 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow May 14 TASS—The Soviet President's aide said today that Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin worked out, at the May 12 meeting with the representatives of autonomous republics of the Russian Federation, a mutually acceptable formula for these autonomies' entry into a renewed union.

Participants in the meeting, Grigory Revenko told a news conference in Moscow, agreed on the following: Former autonomous republics become subjects of the Union and are also subjects of the Russian Federation, except for Tatarstan, which wants to participate in the Union directly while simultaneously signing a treaty with the Russian Federation. The Russian Federation currently has 14 autonomous republics.

Provisions are made in a new Union treaty, he said, to use the principle "one republic-one vote", as well as the mechanism of majority and consensus. There is a general understanding that the country's parliament will continue to have two chambers, as at present, with both nationalities and the entire population of the union represented in it.

Revenko does not regard the May 12 meeting as "a goodwill gesture from Gorbachev to Yeltsin in reply to Yeltsin's signing of the "statement of the 10" (the centre and nine out of 15 Union republics)."

"No bargaining took place. It is now the time of responsibility for this great country," said the president's aide. Both the "Statement of the Ten" and the meeting with autonomies is the process which is required by the Union to stabilise political, economic and spiritual life.

"It would have been disastrous for Gorbachev and Yeltsin to start a political game, whose cost is the Union and the country," Revenko stressed.

On the fate of republics refusing to sign the Union treaty, Revenko said that the process of secession from the Union must be only constitutional, i.e. based on the Soviet secession law. These republics, he added, remain in the Union until the problem has been solved in a legal, internationally recognised way. They will receive a special status. Each republic will have the full right to specify "any special relationship in and with the Union", Revenko added.

He warned against merging the notions "sovereignty" and "property", which governments of many republics advocate. Property can be private, collective, lease and state, he says, but "one cannot speak about the property of supreme or regional governing councils". Many republics, he said, want to obtain as many powers as possible, viewing these powers as property ownership. The point at issue is the freedom of a manufacturer.

Revenko said it was unreal today to put relations between the centre and republics that refuse to sign the union treaty on the hard currency basis. He expressed hope that the Soviet Cabinet of Ministers will take the relevant decision on the principles and rules of relationship, including economic ones, and display "flexibility".

If everything goes normally, the preparatory committee will begin preparing the signing of a new Union treaty next week.

He said the future constitution will hardly retain the former name "the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics", because the names of structures that will make it up will not correspond to it.

### Gorbachev Chairs Cabinet Session 15 May

*LD1505072891 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 0700 GMT 15 May 91*

[Text] An expanded session of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, with the leaders of the republics taking part, is starting its work in the Kremlin right now, with the president in the chair. It is planned that the session will discuss the program of joint action by the government of the country and the sovereign republics to find a way out of the crisis.

### Shcherbakov on Crisis Measures

*LD1505095891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 0900 GMT 15 May 91*

[Report by correspondent Igor Minayev, from the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] An extended sitting of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers is being held in the Kremlin at this very moment under the chairmanship of Mikhail Gorbachev and with the participation of leaders of the Union and autonomous republics. Under discussion is the program of joint actions of the country's Cabinet of Ministers and the governments of sovereign republics for bringing the country's economy out of crisis under conditions of the transition to the market.

The country's deputy prime minister, Vladimir Shcherbakov, reported on the results of the work on the draft of this program. Describing the main elements of the program, he stressed that without extreme, including unpopular, measures we will not be able to get out of the crisis. The main points of the program set out by the speaker outline an energetic transition to a market economy, attracting foreign capital, and reducing state expenditure.

Comrade Shcherbakov proposed that the program be finished off over two to three days, taking into consideration today's suggestions, and that it start to be implemented. The deputy prime minister then replied to questions from the sitting's participants. Representatives of the Ukraine, Uzbekistan, and the Russian Federation spoke afterwards. The extended sitting of the country's Cabinet of Ministers is continuing.

## Council of CPSU Secretaries Holds Meeting

*LD1405230391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1540 GMT 14 May 91*

[Excerpts] Moscow, 14 May (TASS)—The first meeting of the council of secretaries of primary party organizations under the CPSU Central Committee, set up on the basis of the party rules, took place on 12-13 May, it is officially reported here today. The Council has 50 members nominated by the Central Committee of the Union republic, kray, and oblast party committees. They are all experienced officials who head authoritative party organizations of industrial and agricultural enterprises, scientific, educational and cultural institutions, and servicemen's collectives.

The meeting began with a discussion of the results of the joint plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission. Then there was a detailed open exchange of opinions on the whole range of activity of primary organizations of the CPSU in the present crisis circumstances.

The council of secretaries decided to concentrate its attention in the current year on problems connected with the change over of the party organizations to political methods of working in multiparty conditions including working in the position of an opposition party, and on problems connected with the restructuring of party life on democratic principles.

There was discussion of the draft statute on the council of secretaries. Its members came to the conclusion that the council should effectively manifest itself as a methodological body for preparing proposals on questions of the activity of primary party organizations and participation in the drafting of very important party documents. [passage omitted]

The 46-year-old V. Nosov was elected chairman of the council of secretaries of primary party organizations under the CPSU Central Committee. Since 1985 he has headed the almost 9,000 strong party organization of the Moscow Likhachev automobile works.

## INTERFAX Head on Gorbachev-Yeltsin Accord

*OW1405115491 Tokyo KYODO in English 1045 GMT 14 May 91*

[Text] Tokyo, May 14 KYODO—A leading Soviet journalist expects recent moves toward reconciliation between President Mikhail Gorbachev and Russian Federation leader Boris Yeltsin to calm the union's troubled political and economic situation.

In an interview with KYODO NEWS AGENCY on Tuesday, Mikhail Komissar, president of the independent INTERFAX NEWS AGENCY, said that he thinks all 15 Soviet republics will take part in a promised economic treaty, although only nine republics joined in the April 23 meeting with Gorbachev at which it was discussed.

With domestic problems threatening to swamp him, Gorbachev met with Yeltsin and the leaders of eight other republics April 23 and elicited their continued support in return for pledges of political and economic decentralization.

A joint statement emerging from the meeting spoke of a new Union treaty, a new constitution, and the granting of more political and economic power to the republics.

The three Baltic states, Moldavia, Georgia, and Armenia boycotted the meeting, but Komissar suggested Tuesday the six rebellious republics would probably join in with an economic treaty while foregoing the political pact.

Komissar said in the interview that Gorbachev-Yeltsin rapprochement seems to indicate that the new treaty may be concluded in the near future.

Last week in an INTERFAX story, Yeltsin apparently reversed his opposition to Gorbachev, telling Soviet reporters the Kremlin leader supported reforms and added that the two could now work together.

Komissar, a former Radio Moscow journalist, said Tuesday that he thought a Yeltsin victory was virtually assured in the Russian Republic elections scheduled for June 12 and expected Gorbachev to support his one-time protege.

On the issue of Japan-Soviet relations, Komissar said that, prior to Gorbachev's visit to Japan last month, the Kremlin had considered returning two of the four disputed islands to Japan, but was dissuaded from pursuing the idea too far by Soviet public opinion.

"If he had returned the islands, there was the fear that the president would have been overthrown," the 38-year-old specialist in international economics said, adding how it was impossible for Gorbachev to agree to the return [of] any of the islands during his April 16-19 visit.

Komissar pointed out that a March 17 public opinion survey on the Japanese-claimed islands showed that 81.3 percent of the people on Etorofu and 70.2 percent of the people on Kunishiri, Shikotan, and the Habomais, were against any reversion to Japan.

In a later call on Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu, Komissar stressed the importance of exchange of information in the improvement of bilateral communication and understanding, Japanese government officials said.

The INTERFAX chief is in Tokyo to meet with members of KYODO NEWS SERVICE about providing the Soviet news service to Japan.

### Academician Views Interrepublican Agreement

*LD1405082191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0430 GMT 14 May 91*

[Text] As you remember, an inter-republican agreement was signed recently. It evoked considerable interest in society. Certain provisions of this document, though, require a more detailed clarification. Therefore our correspondent Ivan Akkuratov spoke to Aleksandr Dmitriyevich Nekipelov, deputy director of the Center for Economic and Political studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

[Begin recording] [Akkuratov] Aleksandr Dmitriyevich, the joint statement named "Nine Plus One" was adopted recently. It says, specifically, that those republics which wish to sign a Union treaty will get a most favored status. But what will happen to those republics which will not sign the treaty but, for instance, will want to join the union on confederative principles?

[Nakipelov] As regards the draft agreement itself, it does not stipulate joining the union on the confederative principles. First of all, I would like to say that the very concept of most-favored status may be attractive and impressive but it is not very precise in the juridical and economic sense, since in international practice granting a most favored status does not mean that in trade between corresponding subjects, states, custom duties, and so on are abolished. No, they are in effect but the thing is that simply if a given country grants such a status to another country, it applies to it the most preferential terms. In this case it is a somewhat different matter. It implies that within the framework of this union precisely, of those which signed the treaty, a single economic expanse will be preserved, a single economic regime and financial and credit system will be in effect, customs barriers will be abolished and so on, that is, the very concept of most favored status should be understood figuratively here.

It is absolutely naturally that those who fail to sign the Union treaty will find themselves in a different situation. The government anticrisis program, which was adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet in its first reading, stipulates the following mechanism: economic links with those who fail to sign the Union treaty will be implemented on the basis of current world prices. Well, if you want to know my opinion on the consequences this could have for those republics which will not sign the Union treaty, I would say that the economic consequences would be catastrophic for all the six republics, without exception, which currently have no intention of signing the Union treaty. This does not mean that one have to somehow persuade somebody else; this is each republic's own choice, but I think that the formulation of question to the effect that relations within a state and relations with those outside it are different is, in my view, absolutely natural. I think that those republics which do not intend to sign the Union treaty are now beginning to understand this danger for themselves. I have read in the IZVESTIYA remarks by Ivars Godmanis who said that a most-favored status must extend to those republics which will fail to sign the Union treaty, too. I do not quite understand why "must". [end recording]

This is an evaluation of certain aspect of the draft new Union treaty provided by Aleksandr Dmitriyevich Nekipelov, deputy director of the Center for Economic and Political Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Well, one could analyze this document indefinitely and in any possible manner. But I think that it would be better if those republic which sign this treaty would show its advantages in practice. And then, perhaps, other republics will take their final decisions.

### TASS Reviews Soviet Central Press for 15 May

*LD1505063891 Moscow TASS in English 0504 GMT 15 May 91*

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 15 TASS—Jiang Zemin secretary-general of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee, chairman of the Central Military Council arrives in Moscow today on an official visit at the invitation of Mikhail Gorbachev, Soviet president and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Soviet Communist Party daily PRAVDA reports.

The newspaper publishes Zemin's biography and says that "the Soviet Union expresses confidence that the visit will help develop friendship, cooperation and good neighbourly relations between China and the Soviet Union".

PRAVDA reports that Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti will visit Moscow on a working visit between May 21-22 at the invitation of the Soviet president.

PRAVDA and the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA newspaper carry a report on a meeting of the Council of Primary Party Organisation Secretaries in Moscow between May 12-13.

The Council has been set up under the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee according to the party rules.

The meeting discussed the results of the latest joint plenary meeting of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission and party organisations' tasks under the current crisis in the country.

PRAVDA offers an interview with chairman of the Soviet parliamentary Committee for State Construction Nikolay Pivovarov.

He speaks about Communists' law-making activities and their participation in carrying out laws and decision to stabilise the political and economic situation in the country and provide sufficient social security to people.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA carries a verbatim report on a plenary meeting of Russian Communists, which ended in Moscow on Monday.

The RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA newspaper offers the article "I Support the Policy of Radical Reforms", in which Vadim Bakatin, a member of the Soviet Security Council, answers readers' questions as a candidate for the Russian presidency.

PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA write about chairman of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin's visit to Czechoslovakia.

PRAVDA highlights Yeltsin's words that "We should neither forget the past nor build out future on the basis of the past. The future should be built on the basis of the present, on the basis of modern and entirely new relations between our countries".

PRAVDA and RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA publish articles devoted to China's present-day life, culture, achievements and problems.

A group of Soviet journalists speak about their impressions from a recent visit to China in the article "People and Reforms" in PRAVDA.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA publishes an interview with Chinese Ambassador to the Soviet Union Yu Hongliang, who answered readers' questions about China's political, social, economic and cultural life.

In an interview with the TRUD newspaper, Anatoliy Bolyatko, a military expert, comments on the main provisions of the recent inter-governmental Soviet-Canadian agreement on the prevention of dangerous military activities.

PRAVDA, the Soviet military daily KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, TRUD and the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA newspaper carry articles devoted to the 100th birth anniversary of Russian writer Mikhail Bulgakov.

## Leningrad Air Traffic Controllers To Strike

*LD1405123591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 14 May 91*

[Text] Air-traffic controllers of Leningrad's Pulkovo Airport, as well as a number of staff of the construction and assembly directorate, intend to start an indefinite strike on 21 May. Our correspondent was informed of this by a spokesman for the independent union of air-traffic controllers in the city of the Neva, who asked not to be named. According to his information, the air-traffic control staff are very determined, and have let the administration of the airport know about this.

## Politicians Debate President's Resignation

*91UN1473A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 18, May 91 pp 4-5*

[Report on interviews with several political figures by ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondent A. Binev: "The President—'To Be or Not To Be...'"]

[Text] **This question was brought up for the first time in December 1990, in the speech by S. Umalatova at the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies.**

**At a news conference on 18 December, the chief of the president's press service, V. Ignatenko, stated that "the president took this speech calmly and considers it the private opinion of one specific deputy."**

**Soon after that, however, the issue of President M.S. Gorbachev's resignation became an open subject at numerous rallies and manifestations. Then this slogan was supported by striking miners in the Kuznetsk and Donetsk basins.**

**At first the president kept silent. Soon, however (for example, in his speech in Belorussia) he started expressing irritation at the existing situation and, in the heat of sharp criticism addressed at "so-called democrats," he mentioned "destructive forces" you-know-where-from that "feed us" these slogans...**

**And suddenly—a different turn. He expressed his "readiness" to consider the issue but only if it is brought up "constitutionally."**

**The issue of the president's resignation was put on the agenda by the Soyuz group of deputies. Also, totally unexpectedly, on the eve of the plenum some party organizations (CPSU) demanded a report and the possible resignation of General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev. In such a situation, it is doubtful that many would want to be in the president's place...**

**It appears that at this point the issue of the USSR president's resignation has lost its edge. However, by now it has become part of the lexicon of political life.**

**Our correspondent A. Binev met with some political figures and asked them to share their opinion on this topic.**

**G. POPOV, Moscow City Soviet chairman, USSR people's deputy:**

I think that our Constitution allows for resignation of the president, as well as resignation of the Supreme Soviet and the government... From this point of view, the resignation demand is natural and normal. There is, however, a question about the procedure this demand should follow. I would agree that there are constitutional

and unconstitutional procedures. In our situation, however, it is difficult to apply a constitutional procedure... One-third of this legislature (all-Union legislature.—ed.) had not been elected by the people; it had been put together by political parties, trade unions, etc.

Now about Gorbachev's resignation. I think we should very clearly separate two things: There is resignation of a person—Gorbachev personally; and there is resignation of President Gorbachev—the resignation of a specific existing political structure. What the miners demand, and what some of the democratic forces demand, is not a personal resignation, but a resignation of that structure which turns out to be ineffective at this point.

**N. PETRAKOV, academician, USSR people's deputy, former member of the Presidential Council:**

The problem is that the situation right now is really unusual. Premier Pavlov said that the problem is not with the system, but with the people. I believe that the problem is specifically with the system.

I think that those who are demanding the president's resignation assume at this point that either the post of the president will be abolished, or that it will be taken by a person who will be more progressive than Gorbachev...

There is a big question mark in this respect, however. In this particular situation, I think that the first thing that needs to be done is to establish an equipollent political dialog.

A president, who does not wish, or for some reason is unable, to communicate with all social and political forces, does not have a right to consider himself president and should resign.

**A. YEMELYANOV, academician, USSR people's deputy:**

Mikhail Sergeyevich has tailored the current power regime to fit himself. It is an authoritarian, or even dictatorial, power regime, provided for by the Constitution, although he can no longer impose a true dictatorship. I want to note that we have always had a de facto dictatorship, always... But it has never been provided for by the Constitution. As a jurist, Mikhail Sergeyevich, in this respect, outdid all his predecessors. Now imagine that Gorbachev leaves and another man... steps onto this dictatorial, constitution-provided pedestal... Who? Yanayev, Makashov, who else? Do not forget that this issue today is brought up not only by democrats, but also by the Soyuz deputies group.

**Yu. AFANASYEV, USSR people's deputy:**

What is the political line now personified by Gorbachev; what is the political line now being followed by the USSR president and his team?

From my point of view, this line—both as a strategy, and as a tactic—is perilous for our society, for the president personally, and for his team. That is, strategically this line is directed at the renewal of our existent socialism, at its improvement. The substance of this is best expressed by Polozkov: "preserve while improving."

The existent socialism is doomed, and any attempts to improve it, preserve it, and extend its life lead to societal tensions. And this is the line that is followed—as a strategy—by the president and is personified by Gorbachev.

Therefore, the demand for Gorbachev's resignation is not a whim, not tiredness, and not some kind of politicking; it is a well- founded and well-argued position of those who support it. I mean the democratic forces.

Soyuz, however, demands the same—Gorbachev's resignation. Such moments happen in history—when the existing power no longer suits both those who are fighting against it and those who would like to preserve this type of power.

**V. BAKATIN, member of the USSR Security Council:**

I agree that a demand for any politician to resign is absolutely constitutional. But the form of this demand may be unconstitutional—through blackmail, through paralysis and destruction of the economy—that is, the destruction of the means of subsistence for the entire people...

I do not quite agree with Gavriil Kharitonovich (Popov.—ed.) that we are talking not about the resignation of a person, but the resignation of a system. In this case we are talking more about the person. And if you analyze these demands today, you will see that they come from our own (and I use it without quotes because I personally was, am, and will remain a member of this Communist Party)—these demands for resignation come from this party. Gorbachev has not exhausted his potential, just like perestroyka has not exhausted itself. It is only beginning. It has not happened in the economy yet. Only disintegration.

Therefore, I am absolutely against the demand for Gorbachev's resignation.

**Ye. LIGACHEV, USSR people's deputy:**

I think that...it does not make much sense...to brush off the miners' mood. At the same time, I want to say that the question of confidence in a president cannot be decided under pressure from one professional group that is, in addition to other things, not even united within itself. Although, as I said, we should not dismiss it. There is simply a struggle going on, and there is a pressure from various political forces. We should show patience and wisdom. We should find a way to meet all fair demands... I am not as much concerned about whether Gorbachev will or will not be president, as I am concerned with the general state of the party... the state of society and the economy.

**G. YAVLINSKIY, economist:**

Since it is not clear what to do after the president resigns, we should first establish, or if you want, organize a process for negotiations...

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] That is, you believe that now is not the time to talk about the president's resignation?

[Yavlinskiy] We can talk about whatever we want, but it should not be a one-way conversation—to get on the radio somewhere and to shout: "Down, or resign!"; those who represent relatively significant political forces should gather together and discuss all questions, including this one. Why not? But it needs to be discussed, not handled in some other way. Because if he resigns, somebody has to take over the responsibility. Let us say, Gorbachev resigns, and tomorrow Yanayev becomes president. What are we going to do next? Shout again? Or what?

**N. TRAVKIN, USSR and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] people's deputy, chairman of the Democratic Party:**

In my opinion, this is extremely undesirable. It is clear that Gorbachev has exhausted his potential as a reformer inside the country. He will not go any further. There is this socialist fence, and he will keep walking within that fence. But Gorbachev wears the mask of a democrat. In addition, this mask is glued on by a Nobel glue. And he will not take it off no matter what. When the Lithuanian events were in progress, we, for some reason, drew only one conclusion: They did dare to send the army, the tanks against the people. We should have drawn another conclusion that explained why these tanks were stopped. I think it is related to the explosion of public opinion in the country and in the rest of the world. So Gorbachev stopped. Had there been someone else in his place, someone not wearing a democrat's mask, would the tanks have stopped? No way!

Another reason. The power is in the hands of the Communist Party. Gorbachev leaves—the party designates someone else. And this one will by necessity be more reactionary...

Had Gorbachev resigned from the post of general secretary, I would stand even more firm on this position. There are stages when in a sociopolitical situation a moral step is more important than something else. This could have brought back to Gorbachev at least part of the trust. The demand for the president's resignation cannot be carried out.

## Law Enforcement Committee's Functions Outlined

*PM1405104591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 May 91 Union Edition p 1*

[Unattributed report: "Coordinating the Fight Against Crime"]

[Text] A USSR presidential decree of 7 May 1991 ratified the statute on the Committee To Coordinate the Activity of Law-Enforcement Organs under the president.

The committee is to coordinate the work of these bodies in order to boost the effectiveness of their efforts to defend citizens' rights and freedoms, fight crime, and strengthen law and order and legality in the country. However, the committee will not be allowed to interfere in law-enforcement organs' procedural activity.

The statute also envisages that in its activity the committee proceeds on the basis of the interests of the USSR and the republics and takes republic legislation into consideration on questions relating to the fight against crime.

One of the committee's main tasks is to analyze practical work to apply the law along with the activity of law-enforcement bodies, organize their cooperation with other state bodies and public associations to execute USSR laws and other all-Union acts on questions relating to the fight against crime and the preservation of public order, generalize and circulate the positive experience of activity in this sphere, and help develop citizens' respect for the law and implement the policy of the rule of law.

The committee is also tasked with organizing a study of the state of legality and law and order in the country and individual regions, compiling a scientifically based forecast of trends in the crime situation and its effect on the sociopolitical situation, organizing state and other special programs to reinforce law and order, and helping law-enforcement bodies in their involvement in international cooperation in the fight against crime.

The committee is invested with appropriate powers in order to perform these and other tasks. In particular, it is entitled to examine at its sittings reports by leaders of law-enforcement bodies, ministries and other central organs of USSR state management on the implementation of laws on questions of the fight against crime and the preservation of law and order; obtain information and other materials needed for the committee's work; submit proposals on how to improve legislation and take part in formulating legal acts; and provide law-enforcement organs with recommendations on how to improve the organization of their activity.

The commission will include voting representatives from the republics party to the Union treaty in addition to the chairman, his deputies, and leaders of law-enforcement and other state organs and public organizations involved in resolving questions of ensuring law and order and strengthening legality.

The committee staff as submitted by the committee chairman has been approved by the USSR president.

The committee operates in public on a collegial basis. The committee's decisions have the force of recommendations.

### TASS To Produce Documentary Films

*LD1405164991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1530 GMT 14 May 91*

[Text] "TASS reports"—this customary news rubric will, it seems, soon undergo a change. For the first time in the entire history of the news agency a full-length documentary film, "Latvia, A Moment Before The Future," has been produced. So now TASS not only reports things but also presents them visually. The first TASS documentary film has inaugurated a whole series of such works. Immediate plans include a film on Soviet Germans.

### PRAVDA Calls for Press Free of 'Relics'

*PM1405145791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 May 91 Second Edition p 4*

["Polemical Comments" by Doctor of Juridical Sciences Professor V. Danilenko: "How Newspapers Sell Themselves"]

[Text] Time is flying by fast. You would have thought that it was only yesterday that passions were raging over the price hike for newspapers and journals and recriminations and warnings were raining down... The first thing that I have to point out today is that even after a price rise of 200-250 percent many newspapers and journals are still not hanging around the kiosks. Of course, people have frequently subscribed less for print publications than in previous years. The increased prices have compelled the consumer to make a choice: between what's best and what's more essential. That's fine.

Second. The circulation of virtually all print publications has changed considerably. That is also a good thing. For decades people "up above" decided for us how many newspapers we needed and which ones, and the well thought-out subscription mechanism (limits, work commitments, and so on) enabled these decisions to be carried through. Today society has for the first time gotten an opportunity to independently decide what information and what newspapers it needs.

Third. The mass media themselves have begun to change. That is the most important thing. Newspapers and journals are gradually becoming more interesting and sharper and information more up-to-the-minute and varied. People have begun to write about subjects that they previously preferred to avoid.

We should not forget that information is a commodity throughout the civilized world—an extremely profitable commodity, moreover. Admittedly, on two conditions: It must be of a high quality, and you have to be able to sell it. Never before have our newspaper workers had to rack their brains over these questions (particularly the latter). Hence their initial confusion.

The new market situation is prompting editorial offices to revise the concepts behind newspapers. Today it is primarily newspapers with a high news content that are in great demand. Its front page should "screech" information and "sell" the newspaper. However, this idea is having difficulty in taking root in our country..

There are, indisputably, improvements. Leading articles, the editorial viewpoint, and "brainwashing"—the skillful invention of the era of stagnation—have finally disappeared from front pages. But newspapers are effectively still primarily propagandists and agitators. What is more, the drastic polarization of forces in society has resulted in the polarization of newspapers—they have virtually all been divided into two camps and unconcealed passions prevail everywhere.

I would like you to understand me correctly. I am not against politically oriented, biased newspapers. Society needs newspapers like that. What is more, there are no totally nonpolitical newspapers. It is bad that that is the only kind of newspaper we have today. It is bad that their course and methods are so blunt in the worst traditions of former times and that they are so intolerant of opposing viewpoints and so aggressive.

Our press also still has plenty to do as regards diversity and in actualizing information. That too is an important part of the art of "selling" a newspaper and attracting as broad a range of consumers as possible (in addition to "your own" people to whom the newspaper is largely geared). Under present-day specific conditions the above task could incidentally be resolved by introducing another rubric in addition to existing ones—business. The latter should contain information necessary for entrepreneurs (directors of enterprises, cooperative workers, etc). Not advertising, but current information for businessmen.

It is very important to modify the methods of presenting material. For instance, the traditional division of television programs into a week. It is all hackneyed, featureless, and broken down by channels—that way, things are easier for a newspaper. Yet viewers don't choose between channels. They choose either the time that is most convenient for them to watch television or the content (movies, concerts, televised debates, etc). In that case why not print out television programs in a different format that the viewer finds more convenient, saving above all his time rather than the newspaper's. What if, moreover, a movie's rating and year of production were marked with conventional signs...

In this connection where are we to get the space in what are already extremely overcrowded newspapers? The answer is unequivocal: Priorities must be revised, economies made, and reserves mobilized. And reserves do exist. Let us remember how much space is taken up by "mandatory" reports about official meetings, send-offs, congratulations, condolences, etc. that virtually no one needs. How much of this kind of material is duplicated in various newspapers! Why?

I cannot help noting another significant aspect—all our all-Union newspapers are printed in Moscow. For comparison's sake I can point out that only two all-American newspapers are published in Washington (THE WASHINGTON POST and USA TODAY), while at the same time THE NEW YORK TIMES, THE FINANCIAL INQUIRER, THE BOSTON GLOBE, THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, THE LOS ANGELES TIMES, and others are tremendously popular throughout America and abroad.

I am sure that such cities in our country as, say, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk, or Novosibirsk could quite easily cope with producing an all-Union newspaper.

The funding mechanism must be revised and the newspaper given financial autonomy. If you work well, you receive more and have a better lifestyle. If the reader doesn't like you, you have only yourself to blame. That is what the market is gearing us toward.

In other words, the new conditions in which our newspapers are working today have already begun to have an indisputably positive effect on them. Newspapers have begun to change. Everything is still not turning out as we would like. But you won't obtain the sought-after result from the very first steps. Incidentally, it would be good to take this into consideration, looking to the future. The emergent trend is important. It leaves us in no doubt that the periodical press is adapting to fit society and gearing itself to meet the readers' interests. Consequently, we will in time receive different, higher-quality, more democratic newspapers, free from the relics of the stagnant years.

## Perestroyka Association Chief on Perestroyka

*PM0305134791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 May 91 Second Edition p 2*

["Topical Interview" with Doctor of Economic Sciences Vladimir Lisichkin, president of the International Association in Support of Perestroyka, by N. Pavlov; place and date not given: "Crisis, or A Breakthrough to the Future?"—first two paragraph are introduction]

[Text] The word "perestroyka" has gradually disappeared from the pages of the Soviet press; it is scarcely heard nowadays on our television or radio, and if is heard, then it is usually used negatively, or at best with a sense of disappointment. A voice sounds the retreat of perestroyka and the advent of dictatorship. Nevertheless, only the other day the USSR Ministry of Justice announced the registration of the International Association in Support of Perestroyka, which has been operating for a year already as an international organization with a headquarters in Geneva.

PRAVDA's correspondent talks to the association's president, Doctor of Economic Sciences Vladimir Lisichkin, member of the USSR Engineering Academy, and general director of the scientific and production association "Prognostika," about the fate of perestroyka in the Soviet Union, its international aspects, and the International Association in Support of Perestroyka's first steps.

[Pavlov] Vladimir Aleksandrovich, why, despite perestroyka's decline in popularity with the people and the absence of substantial results in the economic sphere, have you nevertheless come to th firm conviction to create and take charge of the International Association in Support of Perestroyka?

[Lisichkin] Above all because a country in the grips of a very profound crisis has no other way out than to move forward along the road toward the democratization of society, which is suffering huge losses primarily as a result of the insufficiency, or to be more exact, the embryonic state of its democratic structures. I am sure that today, however paradoxical it may sound, there are more supporters of the perestroyka processes abroad than inside the country itself. It would be wrong not to take advantage of this unfeigned interest, the desire to somehow help the Soviet Union overcome its protracted crisis and finally become a fully fledged subject of the international division of labor. I am convinced that nowadays a weak Soviet Union is far more dangerous to Western counties than a strong, flourishing, crisis-free Union of equal, sovereign, and independent states.

[Pavlov] It has become obvious that the only palpable result of the six years of perestroyka is glasnost. It does not come without a cost here, but these are growing pains, as they say. What do you think about the economic aspect of perestroyka?

[Lisichkin] If we are talking about the economic side of perestroyka, then it has not yet begun, in my view; or if it has begun, then it is operating on the principle of "one step forward, two steps back." Many recipes have been advanced for overcoming the crisis state of the Soviet economy. I would not like to join the ranks of the authors of failed reforms. I know one thing: The road toward the reanimation of the Soviet economy lies only through the free market, the privatization of property, the conversion of large state enterprises into joint-stock companies, and the reduction of the amount of money in circulation through the sale of stock, land plots, apartments, and agricultural and other machinery. Moreover, these long overdue measures, which may now even be too late, have one aim: interest in the successful working of our economic mechanism and all who participate in it—producers, consumers, and employers (whether they be the state sector, cooperatives, or private enterprises).

The main thing—all these component parts of a single whole must strive toward the same end: a substantial improvement in the quality of our output, and not an increase in its gross volume and a reduction of prime cost through the introduction of modern technology and a really scientific organization of labor. In this there is no harm in turning to Western countries for help, but not with the outstretched hand of a suppliant, who for the moment has nothing to give in return, but on principles

of partnership, equality, and mutual benefit. We have other things apart from raw materials, timber, and metal to offer the West. We have unique blueprints, our own "know-how" and technology of which even the most prominent Japanese innovation firms can be envious.

Incidentally, one of the main aims of "Prognostika," the scientific and production organization which I lead, and of the International Association in Support of Perestroyka itself, is to introduce the latest technology, both Western and Soviet, into Soviet production.

[Pavlov] In this respect, a few words about the foreign economic aspects of perestroyka and the first steps—and the results, if there are any—of the activity in its support by the international organization which you lead.

[Lisichkin] Having opened the floodgates on the road to establishing an external market in the second half of the 1980's and granted dozens, then hundreds of enterprises the right to foreign economic activity, the country's leadership, like a magician that has let a genie out of the bottle, became mortally afraid of what it had itself created, and rushed to shove it back inside by means of all kinds of licensing laws. Unfortunately it must be admitted that it was successful in doing this. Moreover, this is being done on the most noble of pretexts (fighting abuse on the part of certain particularly zealous subjects of foreign economic activity) and with the best possible motives: to end squandering of the national wealth, prevent the West from growing rich by exploiting our raw material resources, and so on and so forth. It must be admitted, of course, that there were some violations, mostly as a result of ignorance and inexperience: Giving someone the right to foreign economic activity and teaching them to find their way around and operate successfully on the foreign market, with its—to put it bluntly—laws of the jungle, are two big differences, as they say in Odessa. Yet, despite all these negative aspects (after all, learning is a difficult and costly business, especially when you have to learn in conditions of a tough, competitive struggle against greatly experienced opponents), I believe that for perestroyka to really become irreversible and for it to start reaping the benefits of successful activity on the foreign market, not just by the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, but the hundreds of independent foreign trade organizations, we should genuinely open up our market and engage in the process of the division of international labor.

Our perestroyka is part of a worldwide perestroyka, the first phase of which began after the 1973 energy crisis, which showed the developed countries in no uncertain terms what danger a world shortage of raw materials and energy presents. In the USSR things are somewhat different—here the problem is the colossal negligence and shortcomings in developing scientific and technical progress. It seems to us that our economy's rebirth and that halting of the country's slide toward disaster.are impossible without that most important element—a fundamental acceleration of scientific and technical progress.

Now is the time to form in the country's economy a whole complex of interrelated science-intensive and high-technology production processes, which would enjoy most favored status.

These are the ideas we were guided by at the "Prognostika" scientific and production association when we decided to set up foreign economic relations with a whole series of partners from the United States, Switzerland, Sweden, Italy, and other countries. While holding talks with all our business partners, the thought that they were anticipating unilateral benefits never occurred to us. All this led us to the idea of setting up the International Association in Support of Perestroyka, of which our association would be a fully equal member.

With this aim in mind an international symposium was held 11 June 1990 entitled "East-West: the Problems of Perestroyka." Soviet academics and practical workers in the sphere of marketing and business took part in the work of this symposium, as well as representatives of foreign firms from Switzerland, Sweden, and the United States.

Directly after the symposium a meeting of the founders of the association was held to elect a board and establish statutes. A president was elected. The board appointed an executive committee of the association. The main range of problems that the International Association in Defense of Perestroyka works on was worked out during the secondment in the USSR of 110 French businessmen, the organization of which was assumed by the association, "Prognostika," and the USSR Chamber of Trade and Industry. The French businessmen familiarized themselves with various spheres of the USSR's national economy. Agreements on cooperation and the corresponding contracts were concluded with them.

A lot of work is going into concluding contracts to acquire the most sophisticated technologies in the sphere of the production of building materials, woodwork, the mining and metallurgical industry, agriculture, and so forth. We are working persistently on joint projects for technocities, technoparks, technovillages, and so forth.

The central role of science and technology in today's, and especially tomorrow's, society requires social processes to be regulated and interpreted in a practical way. We are also devoting a lot of effort to this. Here we do not support the fusion of Soviet production with transnational corporations, but the exploitation of international cooperation with a view to achieving a breakthrough for our crisis-ridden economy and improving the prosperity of our people.

### Lukyanov Interviewed on Work

*LD2704212391 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1215 GMT 27 Apr 91*

[Interview with Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by Igor Fesunenko, introduced by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov; place and date not given;

from the "Who's Who" feature of the "Political Dialogue" program:—recorded]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Fesunenko] If you will allow us, we will as it were go over to your professional duties and talk about something you have devoted your attention to all these years. Since, comrades, we are nevertheless talking to the head of the legislature, we will naturally begin our conversation with legislative topics. In order that our conversation with you, Anatoliy Ivanovich, is in some way logical, let us commence with your first stage as a legislative figure, as it were, way back with the election of the new legislature and the election of the people's deputies which, I think, took place three years ago. I will like to ask you straight away whether you consider the electoral system used for these elections—after all, these elections were the first elections to the new Parliament, the first elections, so to speak, in the era of glasnost and perestroyka—this electoral system, does it suit us, does it suit you and so to speak, the country, or is it your view that it must be revized in some way. Here is a specific question: people's deputies belonging to two different categories, so to speak, were elected according to territorial constituencies and representing public organizations. What is your attitude to this principle?

[Lukyanov] I can only say that for that period, for that time, this principle was the most acceptable because it made it possible in the first place to elect, upon an alternative basis, deputies according to the place of residence and representing the state and national entities, and the territorial ones, and it made it possible to have the entire gamut of society's interests represented. After all, it is now easy to say, but I can say that if it were not for the fact that people representing public organizations were elected, Academician Sakharov, or Academician Likhachev, or Popov, or many of our men of letters, filmmakers, and so on, would not have been in the legislature either—all of them were elected from public organizations. There were, however, more serious arguments in favor of this system, particularly because they made it possible for women, youth, and veterans to be well represented. After all, all this could have disappeared if it were on the basis of simple territorial elections. Hence, in my view, the electoral system which was used was for that period an essential system, and it seems to me that it is suitable for this period of stormy and radical transformations in society. In future it will of course be changing.

[Fesunenko] It will be changing, yes? OK, the second question in connection with this: should citizens who, let us say, occupy leading posts be elected as people's deputies, and should they be introduced into the Supreme Soviet? In our country, ministers and members of the government are not people's deputies. However, their deputies are. Yazov is not a people's deputy, but many of his deputies in command of arms of the service or in command of districts are people's deputies.

[Lukyanov] All in all, one needs to ponder these problems well. The point is that in many legislatures ministers are legislators, and there is no big deal about that. But in our country, prior to the elections, there existed such a preponderance of administrative cadres in the legislature that we then came to the conclusion that the so-called incompatibility principle should be applied. I think that certain amendments will see the light of day here, and everything has to be weighed up here in a very proper manner—who has the right to be in the legislature, who should be there, and who should not. One will have to stop and think not only about the categories of, so to speak, administrative persons, officials, and ministries, but also about other categories, those who, in the process of elections, may at times even abuse their powers, arising from the fact that they occupy certain posts.

[Fesunenko] But, for instance, in the United States there is a principle according to which only those who permanently reside on the territory of a given state, a given territory, are elected to both the Senate and the House of Representatives. In our country, a huge number of people live in Moscow, but they are elected to represent some kind of peripheral republic or kray.

[Lukyanov] From my viewpoint, it is always preferable that a deputy should be from the population and that he should be elected where he works. But time passes, people change, and exceptions may arise here, but this should be the exception rather than the rule, from my point of view.

[Fesunenko] Thank you. Well, for better or for worse a certain number of people's deputies were, as it were, elected to the legislature. A two-tier legislative system, so to speak, has already taken shape and is in operation in our country—the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet. It is even a three-tier system if you take into account the fact the Supreme Soviet has two chambers. What do you think—is this system justified or not?

[Lukyanov] It seems to me that at the present time the Congress of People's Deputies is an essential structural unit of our democracy. It is altogether an essential institution; it is of course not a forum for adopting laws, but it is a forum where political ideas can be expressed, where they can be set against one another, and where there is a very broad representation of the population. While we are on the subject, it may well be that putting it bluntly is risky, but it is essential, at a time when such major changes are taking place in society, to have a place somewhere where you can give vent to your political angst. Well for this, the Congress of People's Deputies is the most acceptable forum.

[Fesunenko] We have observed this. It was incidentally observed not just at the All-Union Congress, but also at the Russian Congress quite recently, such angst was being vented that it was frightening to look.

[Lukyanov] Well, it is better to do this in such forums than, say, in forums which have not been organized and

which are chaotic. On the other hand, I think that once this time interval has passed, there is no doubt that a different parliament will form, a directly elected Supreme Soviet—this is included in a draft Union Treaty. Such elections will not be simple, because one has to ponder what sort of elections these will be. Will they be, say, according to the party lists, or according to territories only? Will they be majority ones or direct ones? All in all, there is a whole series of these issues. However, in principle congresses are born of our history: the first congress of the soviets, the second congress of the soviets—the same goes for the revolution—the third congress of the soviets. At some stages congresses are perhaps essential. As for the future, there will of course be other stable forms directly adapted to the legislative process.

[Fesunenko] In our country, as is known, a whole number of committees and commissions have been set up attached to the Parliament. They are working and preparing laws. This is what happens in the world at large, and it is generally acknowleged in practice, and it seems that no one nurtures any doubts that this is how it should be done. However, doubts are often engendered—and this is being spoken of in the press—by the fact that people who are directly interested in having specific problems resolved predominate in certain committees or commissions. The most glaring example is the committee and the commission in charge of military affairs. I think it is called the Committee for Defense and State Security Issues. It seems that it should tackle the issues of conversion, so to speak, of the military and industrial complex, but I very often read that, all in all, directors of precisely the enterprises of the military and industrial complex, military people and so on, are present there to the exclusion of everyone else. Can such a committee tackle these problems objectively, impartially, and in a detached manner?

[Lukyanov] It is, you know, not such a simple problem. The committees—we have 18 legislative committees directly, and on top of that we have committees and commissions in the chambers. It is natural that if a transportation commission is being set up, then all the deputies representing transportation try to be in this commission.

[Fesunenko] To defend their own interests.

[Lukyanov] Fairly often they defend the interests of their own department.

[Fesunenko] Could this be the reason why, say, the underground railway now costs 15 kopecks, whereas the ticket in reality costs six or seven kopecks?

[Lukyanov] Well, the underground railway was not introducing...

[Fesunenko, interrupting] This is by way of an example, by way of a joke.

[Lukyanov]...This commission. But we come up against this all the time, in industry and in agriculture, where the majority were agrarians. That is why, well, it is for this reason that the system of rotating commissions was set up. They have now been thoroughly renewed. This also includes the commission on defense, where we were striving to include representatives of the most varied sectors of knowledge and of the most varied professions. This, for instance, includes the fact that we also wanted older people and not just young people alone to sit on the youth commission in charge of youth affairs. We wanted men to at long last make their appearance in the commissions in charge of women's affairs, and so forth.

This is a complex and difficult process. It is common to all legislatures. I know the same thing happens abroad. It must be overcome.

[Fesunenko] By the way, Yuriy Vladimirovich Velinskiy from Moscow—I have just been given his telephone message—would like to know the details of how the committee headed by Yuriy Ryzhkov was reformed.

[Lukyanov] Yes, there have been, indeed, many debates since Yuriy Alekseyevich is the head of the Committee on Science and Technology. There have been many debates on the composition of this committee, as it was being renewed. Deputies during the election of this committee—I was in favor of Ryzhkov staying in the post of chairman of the committee—elected far from all comrades to this committee. [sentence as heard] You see, the committee consists of both Supreme Soviet members and people's deputies, in particular, of those who...[changes thought] not always worked actively in this committee, but there were party partialities here and there. I do not like this very much. I think that our committees should represent all factions. And here such a struggle did take place, although, as it is usually said, some representatives of an interregional deputies' group were not included into this committee. I would not agree with this because very many of our committees are being headed by representatives of the interregional group and they are occupying the posts of deputy chairmen of committees, as well as secretaries. As the chairman of the legislature I am very much interested that there are various positions, that various positions are represented.

[Fesunenko] This is very important. Without this it is impossible to adopt an objective decision.

[Lukyanov] Yes, and also the parliament would not be interesting without this.

[Fesunenko] Right. This way or another the Supreme Soviet is functioning, congresses are being convened, our legislative machine, so to speak, is proceeding forward, though not very rapidly at times. And at the same time, much criticism of all kinds is being voiced in society toward the legislature and deputies. You are being reproached, I mean the legislature and not you personally. We have received many letters about this, that there are fruitless talks, that too much time is spent on adopting laws and so on. Recently, on 16 April, on the

"Ekho Moskvy" radio station, I heard a speech by one of the deputies, Yemelyanov, which interested me so much that later I acquired the text of his speech in which he reproached the union parliament in a very serious way, and said approximately the following. I am quoting almost word for word. This is by People's Deputy Yemelyanov: The union legislature is a democratic screen for decisions which are being adopted by the president in an authoritarian way, and further, the more so, especially at present, after the rotation. It is, pardon me for an unparliamentary way of putting it, an establishment guided by herd instinct, which is currently unable to deal with a single fundamental issue. In essence, without being actually born, our deputy corps is practically incapable of reflecting the interests and aspirations of people and incapable of implementing and defending them. So, this is the reproach on the part of the people's deputy, by the way.

[Lukyanov] This was said on the radio or television?

[Fesunenko] On the radio, on "Echo Moskvy," on 16 April.

[Lukyanov] If Aleksey Mikhaylovich said this in the legislature, then first I, as chairman, would have to amend it thoroughly because it is an insult to other deputies.

[Fesunenko] You mean the expression....

[Lukyanov, interrupting] Yes, Yes. I think this is simply not true. It is simply not true. And this may be confirmed by dozens and dozens of examples. The legislature during this time period has changed colossally. And perhaps the main thing which has appeared is that a political figure has appeared in the legislature, a new person. Often this, well, this is a person who has come from his work bench, who has come from a collective farm, a person who has come from a scientific establishment. But these are completely new political figures. Well, I could name dozens of people who have gone into this large and difficult matter properly. And it should be said that the further we progress with work, the more opinions are placed in opposition to one another, the calmer the legislature becomes in drawing up solutions and the more ambiguously proposals both by the government and often by the president are immediately received. Thus, with regard to the latest dispute, yesterday's dispute in which workers very actively participated, it was a dispute about the rights of trade unions in the resoluton of labor conflicts; around 19 people spoke. We have not yet come to an agreed decision. We will work on this. Not a sleeping, but a working parliament is being born. And perhaps, if you ask me as chairman, the main thing is, it seems to me, during these two years the legislature, our Supreme Soviet, has gradually become an original kind of stabilizer of the mood and the situation in society. And this may be the main thing in this turbulent world in which we are living.

[Fesunenko] Comrade Chernyy from Chelyabinsk, honored builder of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, is expressing a curious idea. That is, he has the idea, he proposes consideration respected Anatoliy Ivanovich [changes thought] he heard during discussion at the session a proposal on introducing into the working practice of the Supreme Soviet a so-called third reading. That is, a law has already been adopted, it is operating, and around a year later it comes back and is reviewed as to how it is working and whether it is necessary to adapt it. What is your attitude toward this idea?

[Lukyanov] This is not bad. In some legislatures there is such a practice. But first, I wish to say that some draft laws require three readings, not two readings. In other words, these should be fleshed out in a more substantial way, and it is good that deputies are now trying to calculate how much it costs to pass a law and how it will affect public opinion and public relations. That is also very important. On the other hand, a very useful thing would be to go back again to the laws which we have already adopted, considering that some of them we adopted in a rush. Incidentally, over the last 18 months we have passed 97 in all. That would be a third reading of a kind. But perhaps it would be better to consider how our new laws are being enforced, as a kind of a control measure. And of late we have been doing this increasingly more often.

[Fesunenko] Anatoliy Ivanovich, some reproaches thrown at legislators of all ranks, including those of the Supreme Soviet, can even be somewhat embarrassing to quote, considering the people involved have a rank in the state structure. For instance, the absence of discipline and shortfalls in the quorum are mentioned. This can be observed in the Moscow city committee, in the Russian legislature, and in the union legislature headed by you. At the same time, on occasions cases of petty swindling surface when a person is absent from the hall and someone else uses his vote. In this connection, Comrade Viktor Dmitriyevich Prokofyev from Balkhash, Dhezkazgan oblast, asks what measures do you use, as chairman of the Supreme Soviet, to amend the ways of deputies who work for two, as it were, that is, use the votes of two or four absent people? Surely this distorts the results of a vote. Do any of these transgressors of legislative discipline feel any remorse?

[Lukyanov] I think they do feel remorse and I feel remorse sometimes when I come across such cases. This is very unpleasant, but the main and most decisive factor which can be included here, and the very main measure which has been taken, is the actual rotation. I must say that following the latest rotation, it was only on one occasion in all this time that we were short of a quorum. After the rotation we have had quorum in both houses practically always and the deputies have worked quite actively. Indeed, they have begun to work more actively. Although there are instances of shortfalls in the quorum and then problems arise. And this is then a problem for the commission for deputies' ethics to tackle. I think it is a serious problem.

[Fesunenko] To finish with these questions on deputies 'ethics, morality, a moral sense, here is a question from Vitaliy Ivanovich Kiselev, the juridical counselor of the Troitsk Agropromsnab, [Committee for Supply in Agro-industrial Complex] Troitsk in Chelyabinsk Oblast. The question is, I would say bluntly, acute. How much does it cost to maintain the USSR Supreme Soviet, including transportation, housing, and other expenditure, and also how much money goes to paying the maintenance of deputies' spokesmen? Why have the Supreme Soviet members given themselves privileges and perks? Comrade Kiselev claims deputy salaries are too high. Members of the Supreme Soviet are given second apartments and can buy cars, such as the Volga and so on, while jumping lines. What can you say about this?

[Lukyanov] I can say that the budget of the USSR Supreme Soviet—not the Supreme Soviet, but the Congress of People's Deputies Supreme Soviet [as heard] is 194 million rubles. Relative to our huge budget it is, of course, an insignificant sum. Approximately 50 million goes to pay the wage bill of deputies. They receive, the deputies who work in the Supreme Soviet on a permanent basis, receive 500 rubles.

[Fesunenko] Forgive me, I have just been handed a note from Sirafima Pavlovna Nikitina from the town of Moscow. She, incidentally, asks to be told about privileges and here...[changes thought] and Viktor Andreyevich Monakhov asks who pays for the Supreme Soviet deputies to go abroad, and forgive me for having just interrupted you.

[Lukyanov] I have mentioned these figures....

[Fesunenko, interrupting] Yes, yes, yes, yes.

[Lukyanov] In principle, we have small hard currency allocations, very small and, on the contrary, we are curtailing trips abroad, but in the main, our trips are as follows: If we host a legislative delegation from abroad at our own expense, for the Soviet rubles....

[Fesunenko, interrupting] Yes.

[Lukyanov]...then the delegation which goes abroad representing us goes at the expense of the host legislature. This is the principle of legislative exchanges. These are very small resources and we are trying to spend them in a very cost-conscious manner. It is another matter that sometimes a deputy is invited by some firm, even embassies invite them to come and they pay these expenses. Lately deputies have been rather outspoken against this practice, all the more so because it is forbidden in a number of foreign legislatures. It says here that there are some benefits for deputies. Yes, they have a right in accordance with the law. Everything, literally everything, is settled here in the laws and in the provisional regulations. They retain apartments where they live, where they resided, whence they came, because people may well return there a year after the rotation. As for the deputies who are in Moscow, they live in a hostel or a hotel. We have a small hostel—some 240 apartments in all—and they are always full. The deputies live in rather cramped conditions. There are no special privileges for deputies. I think the deputy's lot is a very hard lot and voters sometimes do not understand it. After all, even when they go to shops where, say, the shelves are empty, they get their share of criticism, wearing their deputies' badges. They receive thousands of letters and thousands of reproaches. Even I now get some 300 letters a day, very outspoken, and there is no need to get offended, such is the state of society and it is we who, to some extent, bear the blame for this state and that is why we must work. This is hard work. It is much work. And it seems to me that deputies even need to be defended sometimes from illegal or unjust attacks.

[Fesunenko] Thank you Anatoliy Ivanovich. Well, I would like again...[changes thought] you mentioned the exchange system when you invite a legislative delegation. It lives here as it were at the expense of the Supreme Soviet. Its hotel or residence or dacha are paid for in rubles and then travel at their expense. This is a reasonable practice, a universal one, and exists everywhere except at the Supreme Soviet. Unfortunately, I would just like to inquire...[changes thought] I am the chairman of the Moscow city committee for defending peace and like any other public organization we have been deprived of such an opportunity because the Moscow city soviet has adopted a decision in accordance with which all foreign guests who come to the union—Intourist, incidentally, supported these decisions—must pay all of their expenses, or we on their behalf, in hard currency only. This is simply too much for us.

[Lukyanov] You know that we have come across this and this is a little drop in the general, as it were, war of both laws and decisions and we must thoroughly regulate this issue. In particular, we need to regulate the trips by our delegations and payment for them. Accommodating delegations in Moscow is not so cheap and it seems to me that we must find a common language with the Moscow soviet.

[Fesunenko] Anatoliy Ivanovich, it is very difficult to engage in exchanges with foreign countries, as it were, at all levels.

[Lukyanov] Yes, well, incidentally we would like to settle a number of these issues in a law on the status of Moscow as the capital of the USSR and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. Work is now underway on such a law.

[Fesunenko] Thank you Anatoliy Ivanovich. I think there is another whole series of questions of this type. But, I think that we have basically answered them and we will now go over to more problematical questions, more important ones.

[Lukyanov] Igor Sergeyevich, I would just like to say that I myself when it was announced that there would be a broadcast, a very great many, a great many letters were

received directly at the Supreme Soviet. People wrote the Kremlin, Supreme Soviet, and I received the most unexpected of letters.

[Fesunenko] This is interesting. For example?

[Lukyanov] Well, I received this rather touching letter from Igor Dolgov, a pupil from the eighth grade in Leningrad. Igor asks a whole series of questions. He writes: When will the Supreme Soviet consider the Constitution? How are things going with the union treaty? Will the Supreme Soviet change the criminal and criminal procedure codes? In general, this was a very thorough and politicized letter from a boy from the eighth grade and this is testimony to the fact that a stormy process of politicization of society is underway.

Mind you, Igor writes me: If you have any questions for me you may ring me in Leningrad. He even gives his telephone number.

Thank you very much, Igor, for this letter. There are quite a few sensible questions here. Apparently, you really do follow very closely what is going on in our legislature. And I, too, have a question. Have you enough time for this in addition to your lessons, classes, and other things?

[Fesunenko] By the way, is everything all right with his lessons?

[Lukyanov] Well, of course, not everything is all right with his spelling, as the letter shows, but I think that it will improve and everything will be ok. But thank you for the letter, anyway.

[Fesunenko] Anatoliy Ivanovich, sorry to interrupt, but this was an eighth grader, while we have here a telegram from a seven-year-old boy addressed to Lukyanov, Anatoliy Ivanovich. It is a disturbing telegram. I am not quite sure whether the boy has written it himself or maybe some relatives or neighbors. Please, help us, mister!—that is you. They want to drive us out of our home! Mommy is a street sweeper. We are three schoolboys. Daddy has not been living with us for six years. What now? Where will we live? Who will help us? Address: 73a Perekopskaya Street, Lugansk. Signed: Valik Kropotko, age seven.

[Lukyanov] Please give me the letter.

[Fesunenko] There seems to be a kind of family drama behind this. Maybe we will later ask some assistant....

[Lukyanov, interrupting] You know, I receive a lot of letters like this....

[Fesunenko, interrupting] I see....

[Lukyanov, interrupting] ...a lot of dramas. I must look into it. If I do not know what to answer I always look into it....

[Fesunenko, interrupting] Of course....

[Lukyanov, interrupting] I will give instructions.

[Fesunenko] You wanted to read out yet another letter?

[Lukyanov] Yes, you know, we have just seen this letter from the boy. And next to it here is a letter that has arrived from Orel, from party and war veterans: Anikeyeva, Stepanova, Ustinskikh, Mikhaylov, Gnezdilov, Vnukov, Vetrov, Sirotkin, and others. A striking letter, to my mind. The thing is, people are speaking about our past, about respect for our past. To me, it is a painful issue. The thing is, I have lived a very hard life. I have seen war, and not just in pictures. I have seen it live. My own father was killed in action. I cannot read such letters calmly. It seems to me that our past, our veterans, need to be treated in a very special way. However complex our history, it is our own history. We only live through it once. I think such letters require great attention. Each time I measure each action of mine, each deed, against those attentive and intense eyes and souls of the veterans to whom the community will always be indebted. There are many such letters and I will keep devoting my closest attention to them, as I have done before.

There are many such letters and I will occupy myself with them in the most thorough manner as before. So, many telegrams, as you see, have arrived. There are many on personal issues, on pardons, on citizenship, on awards, many interesting telegrams. But, I think all of this is in order. We will look into them.

[Fesunenko] Incidentally, Anatoliy Ivanovich, I would like to say that we have also received masses of such telegrams with personal questions and in order to close this topic I would like to give you one more telegram. It is very disturbing and I ask you very strongly that you or one of your aides at least phone the Rossiya Hotel. The telephone number is here. Yelena Maksimovna Pavlovskaya appeals to you. She is ill. She is the widow of Fedor Lavrenovich Pavlovskiy, an executed person and first hero of the Soviet Union according to what she writes. Her telephone number is here. Please be kind enough after the broadcast. I think this is a cry from the heart.

In general, masses of letters have arrived with various requests. Here, for example, from Comrade Belayev a war veteran. He was refused—he is a war veteran who has not worked for a very long time—he asked for a little land in order to cultivate a vegetable garden in the country where around 50 land plots have not been used for more than 30 years. Houses have been deserted. Three local elderly retirees remain in the village. The village has, as it were, completely perished. There is simply a plot of land there. The village soviet will agree to give him land in Moscow oblast only if he is registered there. This seems strange and paradoxical to me now. We will not resolve this theoretically now. The address is here and I ask you very much to pay attention to this letter.

In General, comrades, I would like to say that you can turn not only directly to Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov

with questions, letters, and requests of this kind. There is a reception attached to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet where people come with their complaints, concerns, wishes, demands, and we incidentally visited this reception and I will now ask our producer to show, as it were, what we saw there. If you would be so kind, please. [passage omitted]

[Fesunenko] You see, Anatoliy Ivanovich, the man has been struggling for two months and still cannot resolve this issue. And yesterday we called there and found the matter is still suspended. I would like to ask your assistants to find out the name of this man from our correspondent, Yevgeniy Tolstykh. Maybe, actually, you could help?

[Lukyanov] You know, I think I have come across this request and instructions have already been given on this matter, as far as I remember.

[Fesunenko] Well, it is ok them....

[Lukyanov, interrupting] Because an enormous number of letters pass through my hands....

[Fesunenko, interrupting] Naturally....

[Lukyanov, interrupting] But, in fact, quite a few people come to us with the kind of issues which must be handled locally, which must be dealt with by local soviets, by republican government, by ministries and departments. Of course, we receive ... [changes thought] we do all that we can, but it is very hard. There is a law on dealing with letters, and now we want to adopt a new law on these issues. I must say that each deputy has to deal with an enormous number of such letters and unresolved issued. It is a hard time. Very often it cuts through families like a plow, splitting them into different political camps. The time is hard because it hits, first of all, people with low incomes, those with fixed incomes. One must be very careful here, and very patient. Because, I must say, work in our reception room is most difficult. Sometimes people must be replaced there because they cannot bear the pressure of negative emotions, cannot live with this pressure.

[Fesunenko] Thank you, Anatoliy Ivanovich, but I suggest that we go back to our parliament for a while, if you do not mind.

[Lukyanov] You are welcome....

[Fesunenko, interrupting] There is a question....

[Lukyanov, interrupting] Carry on.

[Fesunenko] It interests not only me, but a lot of people. Do you not think that, very often, as our legislature has been living and working, groups and groupings have formed themselves there, and that this is all quite legitimate, logical, and understandable? The legislative struggle sometimes tends to turn into some kind of fratricide, or even suicide. I mean, first of all, the proposal that has been recently voiced by the "Soyuz" group, among others, to dissolve the Supreme Soviet, the congress, and the parliament [as heard] ahead of schedule, to recall the president, to introduce a state of emergency. It is, somehow, difficult to understand. Why do the members of the legislature themselves call for their alma mater—the legislature—to be killed? What is your attitude on this?

[Lukyanov] Well, I must say, that if these were only the proposals of the "Soyuz" group...[changes thought] for example, the opposite group, the interregional group, thinks that...[changes thought] at least before the rotation it thought this legislature would not do. Proposals were presented on dissolving the Congress and on dissolving the Supreme Soviet. They were also presented by strike committees. Thus, very different opinions assemble at the Supreme Soviet. As to proposals by the "Soyuz" group, I recently had to read out, specifically at a meeting of the Supreme Soviet, an address by a portion of the "Soyuz" group: 22 deputies who speak sharply against their own, so to speak, comrades, who belong to this group, and say no congress is needed now. Now we need to make the country work, and work in a specific rhythm. We need to ensure continuity of power and so on. As to my position, there are now 23 different groups within the Supreme Soviet. When passions run high—well, first of all, I try to prevent passions from running so high and to keep them within the limits of parliamentary language, at the least. When they attack a deputy who is voicing a different point of view or when they attack a deputy to make him support a general point of view, I also try to protect such a deputy. You know, I sometimes recall Turgenev's marvelous words. This is what he said: When Don Quixotes have become extinct, the book of history must be closed because it will not be interesting to read.

So, supporting minorities and people's chances to express their positions, to oppose some long-standing set position are essential matter in the work of the legislature, and for me it has already become an axiom over the past two years.

[Fesunenko] The Supreme Soviet is often criticized for doing a lot of work, but it seems that—people have even said this—it works in vain. That is to say, laws are passed, but then they are not implemented. This is explained first and foremost by this war of sovereignties, the war of laws, the laws at republican level, at Union level, and so on. For example, Laura Lvovna Sinkevich, an engineer in Minsk, wants to know your opinon about the formulation of a Union of sovereign states. Then, Sergeyev from Ternovka also wants to now why the republics, under cover of sovereignty, demand sovereignty, often make war on the Union, so to say. How long can this go on? Here is another from Irina Lvovna Svats of Perm: What do you see as being the fundamental reasons for the war of laws, and how are they to be overcome without basically trampling the interests of the two sides? These are serious problems, I think.

[Lukyanov] Yes, they are serious. I would...[changes thought] there are three groups of questions. The first group of questions is the implementation of laws we adopt. I have already said the Supreme Soviet has passed about 100 laws. We realize they are not all of equal quality. Evidently some very thorough work is still needed on some of them, but I would not agree that these laws are not working. Is the law on pensions working, or the law on the press which you know so well? Is the law on pensions for troops working, on lease contracting? A whole series of laws is in force, is working directly, and that is why they are debated so fiercely.

I agree with those comrades who criticize the Supreme Soviet for paying such little attention to monitoring the working of the laws. Here a lot more work is absolutely essential, a lot greater activeness from the committees and commissions, and from the Supreme Soviet itself.

We have started to correct this. Look, we examined how the measures on Chernobyl are being implemented. We examined how the whole package of decisions on the Aral Sea and the Aral problem are being implemeted. We examined the questons of price reform, how it is now proceeding in practice. Literally for days we observed this matter and listened to the government. We are doing it more and more. We now want to hear how the land reform is going, and how the fundamentals of the land legislation passed by the Supreme Soviet are being fulfilled.

We will to a greater and greater extent go over to monitoring [kontrol]. That is the first part of the question. Of course, the war of laws that exists hinders the implementation of laws in the republics. Putting it crudely, some decision or other reaches the republic and a deformation begins there.

How can this issue be resolved? In my view it is by quite distinctly delimiting the competencies of the Soviet Union and the republics during the very near future. Within the framework of this competency, the Union competency, laws adopted within the framework of the Union, Union powers should be implemented fully throughout the whole territory of the Soviet Union.

The laws adopted within the framework of the competencies of the republics, on the territory of the republics...[changes thought] there will be some kind of joint competency. Thorough work should also be done here, but the path toward a delimitation of competencies is monitoring and good work by the law preservation bodies. Then, the Soviet federation will live as a federation of Soviet socialist republics for which the people voted during our referendum.

As far as the Union of Soviet sovereign states is concerned, this formula follows from the Constitution because in the Constitution each republic is defined as a sovereign state. Both the Congress of People's Deputies and the referendum came out in favor of a Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a renewed federation. I should say that this topic will again and again be studied by the Supreme Soviet. It is the will of people that must not be ignored and it should be put into practice during the signing and elaboration of a new Union treaty.

[Fesunenko] A question immediately arises in connection with this. This process of preparing for the signing of the Union treaty will continue now. If these nine republics whose leaders signed the joint statement with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev should sign it, and if a republic wishes to join this treaty later but does not want to be socialist, will it be accepted into this family or not?

[Lukyanov] The Union will decide this. Moreover, I do not exclude that at some stage or other individual republics might enter the Union on different principles. This is not excluded, but it is essential now to sign the treaty on which nine republics have agreed and on which virtually all the previous autonomous republics, many of which have become Union republics, have agreed.

[Fesunenko] Thank you, Anatoliy Ivanovich. Here is a question that comes as straight as an arrow, a sharp question. There are several of them, Vladlen Petrovich Gusenko from Kuybyshev and Grigoriy Edmundovich Novatyy from Krasnodar I have just been given, Vladimir Borisovich Kuzuboy from Vitebsk, Irina Borisovna Tsvetova from Moscow, and a number of other comrades ask right out: What do you think of the proposal that you should become president of Russia, let us say? Are you not perhaps preparing to present your name? In this connection I would like to read out this question we have just received, a letter from Gavrilova and the Polikovs. It has been typed out for me here. It is not a very nice letter for you, but I will read it out all the same. Anatoliy Ivanovich, up until the Fourth Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR we considered you an active supporter of perestroyka, a friend of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev sharing his ideas. It appears, however, that you are an enemy in disguise. During the session you answered his appeal so rudely that the whole country saw your hostility toward him. You interrupt the president. You are afraid to rebuff any—excuse me, this is what they have written—bastard and pretend that nothing is happening. We advise you when you hold out your hand you should not stick out your leg. I repeat, Gavrilova and the Polikovs from Moscow.

[Lukyanov] You know, Igor Sergeyevich, this is not such a simple question. The fact is that recently our press, for about the last three months, and the foreign press, has kept trying to drive a wedge between the legislature and the president, between the president and the chairman of the legislature regarding the chairman of the legislature as an alternative to the president and so on. I even had to write an open letter in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA on this matter, and the thing is...[changes thought] and it was there, incidentally, that the harshest sorties in this regard were published. I only want to say the following: I adhere to one position here. A man should work where he is indeed a qualified specialist and where he can work with the best results. It seems to me that where I work—may God let me carry out these functions. They

are very difficult and very complex. I am completely convinced that currently there is no alternative to the president and I stated this firmly to the participants in the latest plenum. It seems to me that there cannot be two opinions about this now, and that during a stormy crossing you cannot change horses, especially since this horse is a shaft horse, pulling all the most difficult work in our country. It seems to me that the best of all would be if I were given the chance to continue this difficult and complex work in our legislature. I would try to give all of myself here.

As far as such issues and proposals of candidates for other posts and so on are concerned, it seems to me that we have a great many people who measure everything in terms of a power struggle. I do not have any such potentialities or needs.

[Fesunenko] Ambitions....

[Lukyanov, interrupting] I do not have any such ambitions. I remember each time, you know, the splendid words of Omar Khayyam, the great Persian poet. He said power over people is violence to oneself. This is a very difficult business and people often do not weigh up what a severe and unbelievably heavy burden state power is.

[Fesunenko] Thank you, but even taking this into account I should nevertheless tell you that in many of the letters that have arrived, that we have received during the process of preparing for this broadcast, reproaches resound directed toward you and toward the president concerning a lack of firmness.

For example, Comrade Kaziyev from Derbent: Excuse me for such a harsh question. My youth was spent under the banner of Stalin. There was iron-like discipline in the country. Now there is no discipline and no order. Prices are rising by several hundred percent. The Supreme Soviet has been meeting for years and there are no results. When will we get order in the country, not in words but in deeds?

There are a lot of such notes and letters, and all of them are to some degree in particular connected to the miners' strikes which were going on, and which are still going on. Here is Voronin, Mikhail Matveyevich, Ryazan oblast, the town of Sasovo. The miners' strike has caused colossal damage. What is the Supreme Soviet thinking of doing to stop the strike? And a veteran of the Great Patriotic War, a former miner, Cheromukhin, Ivan Petrovich from Kemerovo. [sentence as heard] Anatoliy Ivanovich, please answer this question: 26-28 March there was a resolution on halting the miners' strike, but they are continuing to strike. You have not taken any measures. Petrenko, Nikolay Nikolayevich, an engineer and economist from Leningrad, proposes that a law be immediately adopted on economic crimes to punish people who organize strikes and disrupt transport services. It is necessary, he even writes, that there should be two or three noisy public trials. Otherwise, we will not be able to stop the destructive actions of destructive mafia groups in the country. What do you think about this?

[Lukyanov] Well, Igor Sergeyevich, first I would like to say that the appearance of the chairman of the legislature trying to bring about an equilibrium among all the sides is probably also deceptive. I am in favor of firm, strict discipline, and will remain a supporter of it to the end. But, I think this discipline must be an obligatory accompaniment to democratic development. Democracy without discipline is impossible. By no means everything can be solved either by force or by a court or by a show trial. After all, what is a strike? I have had occasion to talk with strike committees in Vorkuta, in Kemerovo, and in Rostov oblast. They all met. They were in my office. We spent a long time talking. There is a lot there that has boiled up, that has become painful in the miners' strike movement. The miners must be understood. That is not to say that we do not have to aim to solve their questions by other means. I am glad that the strikes have started to die down now. That is the correct process, but to prescribe to us that we should introduce a state of emergency everywhere and use force to oblige people to tackle something in such a situation would, I believe, be a piece of adventurism.

I am, however, in favor of discpline and order. For that reason, according to the agreement and statement of the president and the nine leaders of the republics, it has been agreed to introduce special rule, a special regime, in the basic industries of energy and several other branches of the national economy. In my opinion this is an essential measure because without firm authority no reform, no renewal of society, is possible. This has been shown by the experience of a lot of countries, and it is being shown quite incontrovertibly by the experience of our country.

So, the legislature will have no other aim except that of moving the reforms forward—we have no other way—bringing them in to peaceful shores, and at the same time, of strengthening discipline, law and order, people's responsibility, and the fight against crime.

[Fesunenko] In this connection, as far as strengthening discipline and bringing about order in the country are concerned, strikes are not the only problem. Interethnic contradictions; blood is being spilled. Look, this huge pile is far and away not all the letters that have come with such questions, requests, prayers. There is a heap of letters, for example, asking how and when the problem of the Meskhetian Turks will be solved. Khassan Usmanov, I hae picked him at random, from Zarya collective farm in Rostov oblast.

I understand that we will not solve the Meskhetian Turks' problem here, but I am simply handing over these letters and they will all probably be looked at later. Nevertheless, what do you think about all these interethnic contradictions? Can they be solved by the efforts of the Supreme Soviet, without any measures, without introducing a state of emergency, without shooting and blood, or not?

[Lukyanov] In the first place, I am convinced they cannot be solved just by the efforts of the Supreme Soviet. These are difficult questions and they must be solved by the republican supreme soviets and the local soviets, the national-administrative formations, the autonomous formations. These are the most difficult questions. It is important only that the Supreme Soviet gives an impetus to this. We have adopted seven major laws on the ethnic issue. Literally every week we have to work on the ethnic issue. I will tell you that I, for example, over the last year, have met representatives of all the conflicting sides. If it was just, let us say, the Caucasus, where a civil war is practically going on in many cases, an ethnic war with the use of weapons and a large amount of weapons. I can only say that all the necessary measures must be used here. In the first place, political ones, talks, the creation of joint commissions, including the public in this, and so on.

A second question: It is necessary to use force in places where it is needed, and it is necessary to introduce a state of emergency, a state of emergency such has been introduced in Tskhinvali, and put the question to the inhabitants of extending it to the whole of the south Ossetia. Unfortunately, there is such a question as well. Those problems which arise in Nagorno-Karabakh, the problems which arise with the Meskhetian Turks. I have twice met a delegation of Meskhetian Turks. This is a very difficult question. They lived on the border of Georgia with Turkey.

[Fesunenko] They have been now been driven out of Central Asia. Georgia is not accepting them. Where are the people supposed to go?

[Lukyanov] These people have now been completely rehabilitated by law, and they cannot return to the place where they lived, as Georgian figures are saying, because these areas are occupied by Azerbaijanis and Armenians, and to some degree by Georgians. It is impossible for them to live here, as they say, but this problem must be solved. We have set up a special commission for this, but there are over 20 of these problems in the country.

[Fesunenko] You mean ethnic problems?

[Lukyanov] Yes, and all of them are tied up in a tight knot, as it were, with economic reform. It seems to me improving the economic situation will be the basis for solving many ethnic questions, including ones of the Russian Federation. Often these problems arise from the republic's own wish to settle all its own difficult economic questions. It think the market itself and its development will be the main centripetal force that will unify our federation and all the peoples.

[Fesunenko] Thank you. Here is another complex question. What is your view of this? There have been very many questions—let me read one such question. There are many like it. Nikolay Ivanovich Meshalkin from Perm asks: When will there be a law enacted in the USSR returning the homes and other property that were confiscated from us during the collectivization of 1930-32? Or will compensation be paid? There are numerous questions like that, about the rehabilitation not only of victims of political terror, but also the so-called Kulaks who were deported from the Ukraine and the Don to Siberia and to other places in the north, in the steppes, during the tragic years of collectivization.

[Lukyanov] Well, first, rehabilitation and a whole series of questions connected with it have been resolved by the Supreme Soviet and this process of rehabilitating people who were repressed for political reasons will continue. As far as the great majority of the population is concerned, during the period of collectivization for example and for many questions I think that for all practical purposes the country can no longer resolve these questions. Here we have to weigh very many aspects both of the past and present and act on the basis of what the country can manage.

[Fesunenko] That is clear. Well, the Supreme Soviet is often criticized for remaining somewhat aloof from the country's day-to-day concerns. These reproaches are often unfair. Sometimes they are justified. It surprised me greatly, for example, when you deputies gave such diligent and inspired attention to a debate on pornography and so on, just at the moment when the strikes were at their peak and the country was on the point of disintegration. I realize the Supreme Soviet is not a suburban electric train that can be synchronized with the weather, that can change its timetable from minute to minute. Nevertheless, is it always necessary to pay such attention to these subjects in the present situation? Is it not more important at the moment to resolve economic problems, to feed people and extricate the country from the impasse, and then go back to questions like the struggle against pornography?

[Lukyanov] I always try to understand the listener's point of view and to pay close attention to what I am being asked. I must say, however, that this is an unfair criticism of the Supreme Soviet. In the first place, we have endorsed an extremely detailed timetable for the examination of laws, and economic reform has pride of place. Moreover, we have consistently examined these questions, the protection of the consumer, enterprises, cooperatives, investment, and now entrepreneurship. Several other market-oriented laws will be examined in the near future. We will continue to push ahead with these laws, giving them our constant attention.

At the same time, there has not been a single question, for example, the decision on the strikes. [sentence as heard] I have even brought it along with me. We adopted two major decisions on the strikes, just as they were in progress. We adopted a whole series of other decisions. Take the demonstrations in Moscow on 28 March, for instance.

[Fesunenko] Yes?

[Lukyanov] The Supreme Soviet reacted the very same day and settled everything, settled it all in a calm and restrained manner I would say. Its response was very

considered. It appealed to the demonstrators, and so on. Nevertheless, against this background people keep complaining to me that, for example, the law on inventions should not have been adopted. But, it was needed. So was the program on state youth policy and that selfsame decision that we adopted on the struggle against pornography and the publication of a large amount of similar literature. This was being demanded not by tens, not by hundreds, but by many thousands of people, who now encounter this type of literature every time they use an underpass in Moscow. The president has issued a decree on this and instructed, set up, a commission. This commission submitted a draft Supreme Soviet decision to us. Our greatest writers, Rasputin and Belov for example, took an extremely active part in the discussion of this question.

[Fesunenko] Yes, we saw all that.

[Lukyanov] Journalists, too. We had to respond. When people tell us that we have failed to react to some event or, on the contrary, accuse us of dreaming up some other event ourselves, this is not so. This is not so; therefore, we discussed this problem.

[Fesunenko] Another question: How can an appointment with you be arranged? That is from Khalima Mustafayevna Bekanova from Kabardino-Balkaria.

[Lukyanov] Through the reception room of the Supreme Soviet.

[Fesunenko] Through the reception room of the Supreme Soviet. Now, Anatoliy Ivanovich, we will have to start grouping questions together because our time is running out. Here is an intriguing question that I would like you to answer briefly, if you do not mind. Esteemed Anatoliy Ivanovich, asks Nikolay Mikhaylovich Litsov from the town of Yuzha in Ivanovo oblast. Lately, church people have become more active than ever before. Religion is reviving. There is nothing wrong with that, but why is the USSR Constitution being flagrantly violated in the process? As you know, it stipulates that the church is separated from the state and schools from the church.

[Lukyanov] In fact, there has even been conflict between different churches, in the southwestern Ukraine, for example. There are other conflicts, too. As speaker of the legislature, I am constantly being called on to resolve many of these questions. I meet orthodox clergy, Catholics, Buddhists, Muslims, Jews, and so on. In other words, I meet a wide range of people. We must respect the views of believers, respect their wish to protect their own interests. This is the purpose of our new law on freedom of conscience, but, we must at the same time be just as careful to observe laws which permit atheism as a philosophy. I think things have sometimes been taken to extremes in this respect, but this extremism is gradually... [changes thought] after all, extremism was a natural reaction after the prohibitions were lifted.

[Fesunenko] Yes.

[Lukyanov] I think everything ought to settle into normality. We must respect the country's citizens, patriots, and democrats regardless of the beliefs they espouse.

[Fesunenko] There are many questions, very many of them for some reason. This issue undoubtedly agitates people. Will a law on immigration and emigration be adopted? When will it be adopted? For instance, Gennadiy Alekseyevich Smirnov, Yevgeniy Viktorovich Valentsov from Tashkent, and Oleg Antonovich Bondarenko ask this question. Comrades, I cannot read out all the names and surnames. It would be a waste of time. Will such a law be adopted?

[Lukyanov] The second reading of this draft law will be held in May this year. This is a very complicated law because it requires considerable investment and outlay of resources, including hard currency that we are actually trying to save.

[Fesunenko] For obvious reasons.

[Lukyanov] Therefore, I think the debate will be a fairly stormy one, but the second reading will definitely be held.

[Fesunenko] Anatoliy Ivanovich, we are already approaching the end of the program. Our time is running out unfortunately. That is the deplorable stock phrase we come out with on these occasions. But what can you do? In conclusion, however, I would like to ask you, as you say farewell to the viewers and before I thank you, to answer Comrade Bibalov, Askar Nazarovich from Chimkent. He has sent a bitter telegram complaining about the price rises, the empty shops, and the hardness of life. This is a cry from the heart, a tearful plea, so to speak. How can we carry on, Anatoliy Ivanovich? Is there any chance for the future? This agitates everybody, he writes. Please answer these people in a few words.

[Lukyanov] This is what I would say: We are living in extremely difficult times. As politicians and members of the present state leadership, we understand perfectly well that we have only just begun a very difficult and complex process. In a certain sense, Igor Sergeyevich, I would say that we are actually a tragic generation—tragic because we have only been able to make a start. I am convinced that this is an optimistic tragedy. I am convinced that we will survive. This is not the first time our country has experienced difficulties. It is not easy to achieve such an immense change in the economy, in spiritual life, in national life. I am convinced that the people has the strength and opportunity to avoid collapse, to survive and surmount this difficult period, and to advance.

The country must work if this is to happen. The country must respect and must create a climate in which the views of other people are respected, and in which legality and law and order are respected. For this to happen, it is

absolutely essential for the country's unity to be strenghtened and for the accords which have now been concluded by the declaration issued by the republican leaders to be implemented properly. I do not think this will be easy.

Looking firmly and calmly to the future, I would also like to wish our viewers all the best, to thank everyone for the letters which they sent. We will study them closely. I did not manage to answer anything like all of them. I would like to thank them for the kind wishes which I and the Supreme Soviet have received. I would also like to thank them for the criticism which we have received. Most of it is fair criticism. We know perfectly well that this is an echo of the difficulties which society is experiencing. This is absolutely clear, and we will try to reduce these difficulties and to justify people's trust.

[Fesunenko] Thank you, Anatoliy Ivanovich. I consider you to be a speaker of world class. I wish you the best of health and success in your work. Those are the words of Aleksandr Sergeyevich Narkunas from Leningrad, and a number of other comrades, including Boromidze from Minsk. Aleksandra Ivanovna Bokal wishes you health and happiness. They all thank you for taking part in this program. I also thank you, of course, for taking part in the program. Here is absolutely the final question. Aleksandr Yosifovich Bardonskiy—by the way, he's Stalin's grandson—asks: What will you do tomorrow? Will you go fishing or will you relax at home?

[Lukyanov] Tomorrow I shall go in to work. Unfortunately, the speaker's timetable is arranged in such a way that he always has to make preparations for work. I would merely like to thank the comrades and say that many advances have been given here. We must work. Thank you, Igor Sergeyevich, for this program, for the opportunity to answer people. Nothing is more powerful than people's trust and understanding. In our difficult times, understanding, trust, and work for our motherland's sake are certainly the most important things.

[Fesunenko] Thank you. So, comrades, we are ending another edition of "Who's Who", in which the guest was Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, whom I wish to thank once again. I thank you all, comrades, for the letters, notes, and telegrams which you sent. I wish to announce that the next edition of "Who's Who" will be on Saturday 18 May at the same time. The guest of the program will be Anatoliy Aleksandrovich Sobchak, USSR people's deputy and chairman of the Leningrad soviet. You can send your letters, questions, and telegrams to Anatoliy Aleksandrovich Sobchak on 18 May. Goodbye comrades. All the best.

## Economic

### Economy Shows Further Recession in April

*PM1505103191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 May 91 Union Edition p 1*

["Statistics and Our Commentary" article by V. Romanyuk: "The Country in April: Consequences of the Strikes"]

[Text] According to figures from the USSR State Committee for Statistics [Goskomstat], in the first four months of 1991 production declined by 5.4 percent compared with the same period last year. This included a 6.6 percent decline for April—the record drop in the last 18 months.

To assess the situation we will cite a few comparisons: Whereas in the first quarter coal production fell by 11 percent, in April the figure was 20 percent. The figures for coking coal were 18 and 39 percent respectively. This has led to a whole train of consequences. Ferrous metallurgy reduced output of rolled metal by 7 percent in the first quarter of the year and by 18 percent in April, and the reduction for steel pipes was 3 and 8 percent respectively. Chemical workers reduced fertilizer output by 8 percent in the first quarter, and by 15 percent in April.

The situation is similar for many other groups of items. Oil extraction is 9 percent down on last year, with the corresponding figures being 13 percent for commercial lumber and 12 percent for cardboard. It would be wrong to ascribe all disruptions to the miners' strikes. The "routine crisis" into which industry has firmly slipped continued in virtually all sectors. Of the 156 types of output covered by operational statistics, production of 115 fell.

The increased price of agricultural equipment has led to a drop in orders. Production of tractors has fallen by 11 percent in the first four months, while grain-harvesting combine production has dropped by 9 percent. The situation with the production of transport equipment is alarming: 20 percent fewer mainline electric locomotives have been produced in the first four months than was the case a year ago, with the corresponding figures being 14 percent for freightcars, 9 percent for passenger cars, and 13 percent for trucks. Only computerized forging and pressing machines recorded an increase (of 15 percent), as did low-power electric motors for domestic appliances and automated equipment (of 6 percent).

The situation in the consumer market is virtually unchanged. In January-April 13 percent less meat was produced from state resources than a year ago, with the corresponding figures being 14 percent for butter and 8 percent for edible fish products. Increases were recorded in the production of flour, bakery, and pasta products.

The meager selection available at stores fully reflects the state of production. According to the results of the first four months, output of fabrics, knitwear, and footwear fell by 10-15 percent. Defense and machine building enterprises are still generating a certain amount of growth in complex domestic equipment: Production of electric vacuum cleaners increased by 7 percent, with the corresponding figures being 9 percent for tape recorders, 3 percent for wrist watches, 2 percent for color TV's, and 1 percent for refrigerators, washing machines, and cameras. If we compare these figures to our previous reviews it is obvious that the growth rates for even this group of goods have fallen.

As for everyday articles, shortages in this area have become even worse. Whereas output of synthetic detergents remained at last year's level during the first quarter, in April output fell suddenly by 21 percent, with corresponding figures of 24 percent for household soap and 26 percent for toilet soap. We recorded an increase in the production of tape recorders, but we produced 21 percent fewer cassettes for them. Once again we received fewer school textbooks, matches, electric lamps, batteries, and stainless steel blades for safety razors than last year. There was a certain improvement in the production of traditional and Western-style cigarettes: The four-month figures revealed a lag of 5 percent on last year's level, but by April the level of April 1990 had actually been achieved.

The breakdown of economic ties is having the most pernicious effect on the state of contract discipline. In the first four months of the year output worth 10 billion rubles [R] was not delivered, and April alone accounted for R3 billion of this figure. If we make the comparison with January-April 1990, the total backlog has increased by 70 percent, with the corresponding figures being 220 percent in the fuel and energy complex and 240 percent in the metallurgical complex. The largest number of enterprises failing to fulfill their contract commitments were to be found in the chemical and timber complex (46 percent), slightly fewer in the metallurgical complex (44 percent), while the figures were 31 percent for the fuel and energy complex and 34 percent for the machine building complex.

In the opinion of V. Tolkushkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Goskomstat, the overall decline in production this year could be 18-22 percent. On what basis is that conclusion drawn? On the basis of a specific analysis. Enterprises' intentions (plans) for this year have turned out to be on the whole 10 percent lower than the 1990 level. As of 15 April the rate of completion of contracts for output deliveries was 91 percent for industry as a whole (it had been 88 percent on 18 March). The contract campaign has thus come to a standstill, and the current level will most likely be maintained. The estimated figure of R10 billion for output undelivered in the first fourth months of the year represents 1.9 percent of the program. By adding up all these figures, any reader can produce an independent year-end forecast and is quite likely to be pretty accurate.

Every one is talking about the 2 April retail price reform. But at the same time new wholesale prices have come fully into force in the light and food industries. Whereas the overall price level increased by 83 percent in the first quarter of 1991 compared to the first quarter of 1990, in April it increased by 110 percent. To a certain extent this was brought about by the increase in contract prices, the proportion of which has considerably increased in certain industrial sectors. For instance, in the first quarter alone the proportion of contract prices increased by 80 percent in the chemical industry and by 140 percent in the paint and varnish industry.

It was with all these problems that we entered May—a month full of holidays. This review was prepared 13 May, which was only the sixth working day of the month so far. Well, as we work, so shall we live.

## Cabinet of Ministers Discusses Economic Forecast

*PM1405152291 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 May 91 Union Edition p 2*

[Article by TASS observer B. Grishchenko: "The Market: One Set of Rules"]

[Text] The latest USSR Cabinet of Ministers session put an end to pointless debates about the timing and means of switching to the market system. Its conclusions can be regarded as the final answers to the three main questions that have long been worrying people:

First, 1992 should become a period of accelerated transition to new economic relations. There must be no more delaying or hesitating, otherwise there will be total collapse of the economy with unpredictable consequences.

Second, it is necessary resolutely to abandon all kinds of half-steps and half-measures, which, as experience shows, only exacerbate the crisis. The model for the market that is being set up is outlined quite clearly by this brief remark by the head of the Cabinet: "Let us pin our hopes on the strong. They will be the locomotives, pulling the rest of the train behind them."

Third, the building of the market must be based on a clear program of attracting foreign investment into the Soviet economy. Otherwise we will simply "eat up" loans, as is happening now.

From these three features you can form a "verbal portrait" of where the Cabinet is leading the country by not only resolutely declaring its own commitment to the idea of the market, but also, on this occasion, demonstrating readiness to fight for that idea.

The occasion for this decisive "showdown" was the discussion of the forecast for the country's economic development in 1992. Obviously the danger of once again leaving the country without a plan or budget, as happened this year, made the Cabinet set aside the most pressing current tasks, engage in serious consideration of the near future, and start "preparing the ground."

So the draft document submitted to the government by a new Union structure that is still in the process of formation—the Ministry of Economics and Forecasting—was sent for radical reworking, after a heated and rigorous discussion.

The compilers are allowed only a week to rework it. Summing up the session, V.S. Pavlov stated tactfully but resolutely: "The document we examined is interesting in itself, but we will not take it as a basis."

Why not? Even a superficial study of the forecast itself and the appendixes to it show that the Cabinet was given yet another program for all-embracing state orders, leaving the market only one opportunity—to develop according to the "residual principle." We have seen many times before what that kind of "planning" leads to.

One example will suffice: The forecast makes strict provision for some 650 production "positions" in all: from oil, steel, and coal to domestic refrigerators and children's tights. Just like the old days.

Who is such a program written for? For the ministries and departments. What do the "free producers" of goods—the enterprises—have to do with it? Where is their interest, their incentives to increase production, without which you can never saturate the market? Nowhere, it appears.

The second vulnerable point in the latest "Union-republic state order," on close examination, proved to be something that has wrecked a great many of our plans in the past: A kind of indestructible faith that tomorrow will be better than today. It was this emphasis in the forecast that prompted the first wave of perplexed questions: Given the deepening decline in production, how can you assume any growth, however modest, in 1992?

Unfortunately, the Cabinet members did not, in our view, receive a cogent answer to this crucial question. The compilers of the forecast were proceeding from the present, 10-percent level of decline in national income. It is clear now that this negative figure, for the time being, is only going one way—it is getting bigger.

A typical example. To realize the proposed economic development forecast, it will be necessary to find an additional 13 billion foreign currency rubles. Without, of course, forgetting the debt of 10 billion.

Some very simple sums gave the Cabinet members the answer—after the most essential, priority payments, R1.5 billion in freely convertible currency will be left for the development of all (!) sectors of the national economy next year. This is penury, there is no other word for it. It is well known that many sectors, including those that produce consumer goods, simply cannot exist without imported raw materials.

We have learned to share out currency, like everything else, but not to earn it. It seems to me that after this Cabinet session it finally became clear to everyone: There is nothing more to share out. We need a program for attracting foreign investments into the economy. A program, the prime minister stressed, not agreements on individual projects or spontaneous efforts.

I think it is worth dwelling on this in more detail. After all, it was the head of the present Cabinet whose numerous opponents, after the operation to exchange large banknotes, tried to create an image of him as a committed opponent to the penetration of foreign capital into the country and the "dollarization" of the Soviet economy. It turns out that it is the prime minister who is insisting on constant, systematic work with promising foreign partners. We have to announce competitions, he said in particular. Sometimes we simply grab at the first offer.

Developing this point, the head of the Cabinet went on to cite the well-known fact that our backward technology has given the country enormous wealth in the shape of all kinds of production waste. At the moment we regard this wealth as garbage, and that has led to an unnatural confrontation between production and ecology. Is not this an area in which foreign investments could be brought in, on a mutually beneficial basis?

A key question in the debate was who should be the main protagonist in the emerging market: the Union, republics and regions, departments, or enterprises. A clear answer was given to this fundamental question: The producers of output—the enterprises—should themselves be the owners of the emerging economic space. So that people can begin making progress toward the goal without constantly looking over their shoulders, the conditions of work in 1992 must be formulated as market conditions.

From now on it is up to the enterprises, and the reworked forecast should reflect that quite clearly. In these conditions it is no use pining for the old, disintegrated economic ties. They cannot be restored.

If plants, associations, and organizations want to conclude contracts between themselves with the aim of boosting production, the center's sole task is to promote such partnership. The main initiative here, however, belongs to the territories. Given this approach, the prime minister stressed, we will be able to formulate the plan for 1992 no later than June.

It is expected that this course will be supported by a corresponding policy on prices and taxes and by the banks' position. Hence "pinning our hopes on the strong"—those who are capable in practice of ensuring a real return on the foreign and domestic market in the near future. These enterprises should become levers that the country will be able to use to extricate itself from the quagmire of crisis. Everything that does not work, the prime minister said, must simply be discarded.

As an illustration, he cited consumer goods production planning. In this sphere, V.S. Pavlov believes, what is needed is "not just another program, but the satisfaction of demand." This position should be incorporated in the forecast.

The proposal by the head of the Cabinet to single out from the universal shortages a few items that are particularly problematic for the consumer, so as to concentrate efforts and resources on satisfying demand for these goods, seems promising.

Another priority in the immediate term should be internal convertibility of the ruble. Without this, the way to a real market is barred.

The economic development forecast for next year, it was decided during the discussion, should be based on joint organizational work by the center and the republics. The prime minister described such a forecast as the "general rules of the game."

The discussion showed that not even all the government members are willing to "play" by these rules. Furthermore, the road to the market that the Cabinet of Ministers has firmly embarked upon will obviously require consolidation first and foremost in V.S. Pavlov's own team.

### Miners Union Proposes 20 May Moscow Congress

*LD1405132191 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 14 May 91*

[Excerpt] The Central Council of the Soviet miners' union has proposed that a congress of Russian miners be held in Moscow on the 20th of this month. The independent miners' union in turn has called on miners of the Russian Federation to send representatives of the workers' and strike committees to the congress to put more pressure on the government so it would meet [word indistinct] strike demands. [passage omitted]

## Agricultural

### Chemical Shortage Hits Stavropol Grain Farmers

*PM1405091191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 May 91 Second Edition p 2*

[V. Pankratov report: "Meanwhile Aircraft Remain Grounded"]

[Text] Stavropol Kray—Some 32,000 agricultural workers are involved in spring field work in Stavropol Kray. Sowing of early grain crops was completed within the optimum deadlines. A total of 1.41 million hectares has been allocated to spring crops. Winter grain is promising good yields, although much work remains to be done to secure them. In some areas plant diseases present a serious threat, and special preparations are needed to treat them. Supplies of chemicals in the kray as a whole cover less than one-fourth of the requirement.

"I am very worried about all this," V. Ageyev, chairman of Petrovskiy Rayon's kolkhoz [collective farm] named for Kirov, told me. "The absence of the necessary chemicals may inflict great damage on the harvest. Most annoying of all is that you cannot identify the culprits. When it comes to us, it is another matter. If, for example, the farm fails to meet its grain deliveries to the state, it has to pay a fivefold fine. Will anyone have to answer for the shortfall in delivery of fungicides?"

Meanwhile, as a result of the warmer weather, weeds are proliferating. Yet the aircraft remain grounded. In many of the kray's rayons they cannot take off because of gasoline shortages.

Corn accounts for a considerable share of the grain balance in Stavropol Kray. Yet less than half the allocated area has been sown with corn. Its potential is exceptionally high. But how can it be exploited if the "Stavropolkhleboproduct" association is poorly supplied with the drying equipment necessary to process the cobs? The kray's kolkhozes and sovkhozes [state farms] are unable to market all their corn without delays in the fall. As a result, some farms have reduced the area allocated to this valuable crop. This trend has emerged in Krasnogvardeyskiy, Novoselitskiy, Georgiyevskiy, Ipatovskiy, Novoaleksandrovskiy, Kirovskiy, Predgornyy, and a number of other rayons.

The Stavropol grain growers are managing to maintain their reputation quite well; however, the disruption of normal economic ties has hit them too. They are also making enough mistakes of their own... The collective of the "Grachevskiy" Sovkhoz, for example, passed a vote of no confidence in their director. People recommended farm Chief Engineer S. Gubanov for this post. Yet the rayon soviet executive committee and the rayon agro-industrial association were very lukewarm about his candidacy. Two months were spent on debates and gossip. Ultimately the labor collective got its way. But while the debate was under way, before the matter was decided, a number of key technological operations in tending the grain crops were not carried out on time.

### Early May Weather, Crop Development Described

*PM1405152191 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 14 May 91 p 2*

[Report by agrometeorologist S. Malikova: "The Weather and the Crops"]

[Text] Over most of the country's European territory, the first 10 days of May were moderately warm and rainy, favoring the growth and development of plants. The maximum air temperature over most of the area was 21-25 degrees; and as high as 30 degrees in the Volga area and most of the Urals area. There was frost in the northern half in the second half of the 10-day period, and in the Urals region as well at the beginning of the period. There was the possibility of damage to flowering fruit crops in Bryansk and Orel Oblasts, in places in southern parts of the Central Chernozem Zone, in northeastern parts of the Ukraine, and in northern parts of Volgograd and Rostov Oblasts.

There was a considerable amount of rain. Moldova, the greater part of the Ukraine and the Central Chernozem, Latvia, a number of areas of Belorussia, parts of the Central and Volga-Vyatka regions, and also Krasnodar Kray had the most rain (31-50 mm and more, which in parts is two-four times the average for the period).

Winter crops continued stem growth, tillering in the north. In most parts, winter wheat ears have developed 17-20 spikelets, and rye ears 30-35, which is near average. Winter wheat is between 25 and 55 cm tall in

the Chernozem zone and 10-15 cm tall in the Nonchernozem Zone. Early spring grain crops have germinated south of a line joining Riga, Vilnius, Moscow, Ulyanovsk, Samara, and Orenburg. In the southern half of the Ukraine and Rostov Oblast and in southern parts of Volgograd Oblast spring barley has started tillering.

By 10 May, on the European territory of the USSR, apple trees were in blossom south of a line joining Ternopol, Vinnitsa, Chernigov, Saratov, and Samara. By the end of the period the cherry blossom boundary had advanced to a line joining Grodno, Vitebsk, and Bryansk and on through southern parts of Voronezh Oblast. Clover and alfalfa continued to grow in the extreme south of the territory, beginning to form flower clusters in the extreme south of the territory. Sugar beet was forming the second and third pairs of true leaves in Moldova and Krasnodar and Stavropol Krays. Shoots have emerged in most of the Ukraine and in the Central Chernozem region.

It was warm in the republics of the Transcaucasus. Georgia and northern parts of Armenia and Azerbaijan had the most rain (15-35 mm and more). Wheat and barley have eared in Azerbaijan. Early-sown cotton has developed the first true leaf; over the rest of the territory shoots have appeared. The cotton is in good condition on the whole.

The weather remained warmer than usual in the farming areas of West Siberia and in Kazakhstan. The temperature was 2-5 degrees above average in the 10-day period in most parts. Only at the beginning of the period was there air and ground frost nearly everywhere. There was no precipitation or less than 10 mm in most parts. Winter crops were in the stem-extension phase in most parts, but were tillering in the north. The phases are arriving one-two weeks earlier than average. Perennial sown grasses were showing stem growth and forming side shoots.

The weather was variable in Central Asia. It was a number of areas of Tajikistan, southwest parts of Turkmenia, parts of Uzbekistan, and northern parts of Kirghizia that had the most precipitation. Conditions for field work were good on the whole. Winter crops continued stem growth. In Turkmenia and southern parts of Uzbekistan the crops have eared and flowered and have achieved milky ripeness in southern parts of Turkmenia. In most parts of the territory cotton has formed the first leaf, early-sown crops have formed the third.

## Agrarian Bodies Support Ryzhkov Candidacy

*914B0154A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 12 May 91 p 1*

[Unattributed article: "An Important Decision"]

[Text] As previously reported in the press, on 8 May there was an expanded meeting of the presidium of the Agrarian Union of Russia and the All-Russian Council of Kolkhozes [collective farms] with the participation of people's deputies of the USSR and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. They discussed questions concerning the republic's position in the agro-industrial complex and candidates for RSFSR president.

The first issue was discussed by RSFSR Minister of Agriculture G.V. Kulik. Kolkhoz and sovkhoz [state farm] leaders and people's deputies strongly criticized the leadership of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and the republic Council of Ministers for their inconsistency in implementing the laws on priority development of rural areas and serious omissions in the material and technical support for kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and peasant and Western-style farms.

Collectives of many sovkhozes, kolkhozes, poultry farms, and enterprises of the Russian agro-industrial complex included among the first candidates for the post of RSFSR president N.I. Ryzhkov, former chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. A report on this was given by the chairman of the RSFSR Agrarian Union, Chairman of the All-Russian Council of Kolkhozes V.A. Starodubtsev. There were also proposals from representatives of collectives of sovkhozes, kolkhozes, and agro-industrial formations of Moscow, Ryazan, Tula, Kaluga, Smolensk, Tver, Vladimir, and other oblasts and krays. Specifically, among the speakers were M.I. Ionushkin, chairman of the Kommunisticheskiy trud Kolkhoz in Meshchovskiy Rayon in Kaluga Oblast; N.A. Kostyakov, director of the Rassvet poultry farm in Tula Oblast; L.N. Miglinskaya, milkmaid of the Talashkinskaya poultry farm in Smolensk Oblast; M.I. Lapshin, director of the Zavety Lenina Sovkhoz in Moscow Oblast and chairman of the faction of agrarian workers in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and V.I. Zhiganov, director of the Kammenobalkovskiy Sovkhoz in Stavropolskiy Kray. They said that it was with the nomination of N.I. Ryzhkov for RSFSR president that the people associate their hope for stabilization of the situation in the republic, the halting of the wild growth of prices, and the strengthening of the social protection of the population.

The joint meeting supported the proposals from the labor collectives that nominated N.I. Ryzhkov as a candidate for the post of RSFSR president and called for republic, kray, and oblast agrarian (peasant) unions, kolkhoz councils, and collectives of kolkhozes, sovkhozes, poultry farms, agricultural combines, and all enterprises of the RSFSR agro-industrial complex to support the proposals of the farms that nominated N.I. Ryzhkov as a candidate for the post of RSFSR president and to conduct the necessary explanatory and agitation work and unite the efforts of party, trade union, Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League], and veterans organizations operating in the agro-industrial complex and other branches of the country's national economy for conducting the election campaign and ensuring the election of Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov to the post of president of the RSFSR.

## Scientific

### Soviet-European Space Conference Begins

*LD1305134191 Moscow TASS in English 1314 GMT 13 May 91*

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Khrustov]

[Text] Moscow May 13 TASS—Problems and Prospects for the development [of the] aerospace complex and related industries, joint space projects of European countries and training of specialists for the aerospace industry are the main topics discussed by participants in the first conference of heads of leading Soviet and European aerospace firms.

The Soviet-European industrial space dialogue opened today at the centre of international trade and scientific and technological ties with foreign countries. It is sponsored by the European Space Agency and the international research and training centre Cosmos.

"Achievements of Soviet and world cosmonautics show that the economy of many countries gains from uses of space", Academician Ryzhov, chairman of the Soviet parliamentary committee for science and technologies, president of the international scientific and training centre Cosmos and rector of the Moscow Aviation Institute, said at the opening of the conference.

"Apparently, the gain could be larger if all countries which are actively engaged in space exploration, including European countries, developed wider international cooperation and specialisation. This would make it possible to avoid unnecessary duplication and save large funds. The Soviet Union, for instance, could offer its partners high-capacity boosters to put heavy earth satellites and other spacecraft in orbit".

G. Van Reeth, managing director of the European Space agency, shared the views of Academician Ryzhov. He dwelt on European space projects and programmes which can be implemented in near future.

Many well-known Soviet space firms display their projects showing achievements and prospects of the Soviet space science and its contribution to the national economy and the development of international cooperation in space exploration. Scientists and specialists of scientific production amalgamations "Energiya", "Molnia", "Vympel", "Komposit", design office "Salyut" and others participate in the conference.

## Military

### All-Army CPSU Committee's Surkov Interviewed

*PM1405155591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 May 91 First Edition pp 1, 2*

[Interview with Lieutenant General M. Surkov, USSR people's deputy, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Defense and Security Questions and the Commission on Deputies' Ethics, and member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, conducted by Lieutenant Colonel Yu. Mamchur; place and date not given—first five paragraphs are introduction: "Lieutenant General M. Surkov: 'Experiencing People's Joys and Woes'"]

[Text] The name of Lietenant General M. Surkov has been in the news of late: USSR people's deputy, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Defense and Security Questions and the Commission on Deputies' Ethics, and member of the CPSU Central Committee (where he is a member of the Commission on Youth Policy). That, figuratively speaking, is the visiting card of the person who heads the third-largest body of Communists after the Russian Federation and the Ukraine, having been elected secretary of the Armed Forces' first-ever All-Army Party Committee. At the recent joint plenum of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission he was elected a member of the party Central Committee Politburo.

Our newspaper has frequently written about Mikhail Sergeyevich. Back when he was a division political department chief, at any event, long before his present high posts.

In Armenia, as a member of a formation military council, Surkov was known as "our general." At the height of the Karabakh events he went essentially on his own to face a seething demonstration of many thousands of people besieging the republic Supreme Soviet building. He suceeded in making them not just listen but pay heed to his words without the use of a bullhorn or a Special Purpose Militia Unit [OMON], thereby averting very probable bloodshed.

When the mountains shook and the earth gaped, he rushed to the very center of the earthquake. As an organizer of the disaster clear-up operation he was elected people's deputy precisely there in the tormented, lacerated, and devastated Leninakan-Shirakskiy National-Territorial Electoral District. Surkov then assumed yet another heavy burden as a political worker in the Special Region.

At the First Congress of People's Deputies he sent a note to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev saying that the Army should not be used in interethnic conflicts. On returning home he has made the most strenuous efforts to reconcile the hostile parties. He acts both as legislator and mediator to end the fratricide and prevent young soldiers getting shot. He has endured everything. There was even an attempt to take him hostage. To Surkov's somewhat embarrassed admission, he had to grab a grenade. After weighing up the pros and cons, the thugs abandoned this tempting idea—to save their skins.

[Mamchur] In short, Mikhail Semenovich, your name is one long familiar to our readers. On behalf of many of

them I congratulate you on your election as secretary of the All-Army Party Committee and member of the Politburo.

[Surkov] Thank you.

[Mamchur] The heavy responsibility placed on you dictates my first question: How do you regard the present situation in the party?

[Surkov] I regard it as critical. The joint plenum—which was extremely fierce and fraught—gave a graphic idea of this with its pointed, disagreeable comments addressed to the party leadership. Unfortunately, a certain section of the party aktiv finds it very difficult to accept the switch to new conditions of social life—with its democratization, multiparty system, and pluralism.

The situation is also complicated by the fact that, at the prompting of the party's opponents, the blame for everything is, excuse my expression, dumped on us. Take, for example, the present leadership of Moscow, Leningrad, and certain republics. If something works they say: "We did it." If something collapses, who is guilty? "The party bigwigs!" It is a convenient label and catchword, although today all oblast, city, and most republic party committees are headed by people who have come over the political horizon during the years of perestroyka.

[Mamchur] But the party does have a propaganda apparatus which...

[Surkov] Yes, it can be accused of not being combative enough. But it should be borne in mind that the political movements opposing us do not as a rule balk at any form or method—if they can be so described—of influencing people. Their arsenal includes includes sophisticated exploitation of difficulties. Blatant incitement. Populism, sometimes plumbing the depths of cynicism. And espousal of the principle of "the worse, the better." And it works. But we cannot go down that route. It is our mission to tell people the truth, no matter how bitter that may be. That is very difficult.

And yet I am not inclined to overdramatize the situation. Today, in my view, all party committees—from top to bottom—are stepping up their activity.

[Mamchur] Who, then, are your closest comrades-in-arms now?

[Surkov] The committee has 89 members, ranging from deputy defense minister to platoon commander. I think that the public will have the opportunity to get to know us yet.

We have determined for ourselves what the main thing in everything is, namely honesty, frankness, and good will. In order that an Army or Navy communist should, regardless of his rank or title, feel and understand when he turns to a member of our committee that he is welcome here and that people here are ready to hear him out and help if need be. By word and deed.

And we have also set ourselves the goal of ensuring that workers in party structures do not immediately become petty bureaucrats or "emissaries to the people" and do not spend all their time on the phone, but instead operate directly in the thick of events, at the grass roots, among communists. Ensuring that they experience their joys and woes.

[Mamchur] But that requires an appropriate choice of personnel. However, there is the opinion abroad that capable, promising political workers today in no way strive to become party committee secretaries...

[Surkov] I fundamentally disagree there. Even a cursory analysis shows that party committees are headed by people who, while having great experience of life, still have a good number of years in reserve. All of them, from division to district and fleet level, have a higher military education. And why, anyway, are we talking only about political workers? In each case communists themselves have decided who is to be secretary. Quite a few comrades have been elected from command, engineering, technical, and other posts.

[Mamchur] So the separation of military political organs and party committees has finally been accomplished...

[Surkov] Officially, from the legal standpoint, yes. But in life everything is somewhat more complicated. A well-oiled and tested system of political organs has functioned for decades. Naturally, quite a few difficulties have arisen with the creation of new structures—there are no precedents or necessary experience. So in practice the separation of functions, it can be said, is only beginning to be established. But no one imagines that on its completion we and the military political organs are going to turn our backs on each other and begin to pull in different directions.

[Mamchur] There was concern expressed at the All-Army Conference that ideological work was slackening off. The call for the Communist Party's ideas to be defended with more determination received support. But the whole spectrum of political currents within the CPSU itself is pretty wide, as the plenum demonstrated, ranging from neo-Stalinism on the one hand to liberal democracy on the other. Won't this soil give rise to disunity in the ranks of Army Communists?

[Mamchur] Yes, many different shades and positions are represented in the CPSU today—but that is a separate discussion. There is also the danger of factionalism being introduced into the party. We are concerned about this problem. Although there are not, so far as I am aware, any clearly pronounced tendencies in the Army as yet.

[Mamchur] The views held by a Politburo member and secretary of the All-Army Committee are clearly not unimportant here....

[Surkov] I am a convinced supporter of the idea of democratic renewal of our society within the framework of the socialist option. I consider that in carrying out

reforms, on the one hand, caution and reflection are essential, while, on the other, persistence and consistency are also required. I recognize the need to make the transition to market relations, but I see this transition only via a strict—at least initially—centralization of resources and their planned distribution.

I favor radical transformation in the party on democratic principles. At the same time, I cannot conceive of the party without healthy party discipline. I cannot, let us say, imagine a communist refusing to carry out a majority decision. What grounds would we have then to say that we were an organization? What should unite us is the most important thing—our attitude to the party Rules and Program. If you agree completely—fine. If you see new phenomena and have sensible suggestions—come on, make a suggestion. Let us discuss it, perhaps you are right. The one thing I will not accept is a rush to extremism—right or left. It leads to no good—witness the processes under way in society.

[Mamchur] The combined plenum, for all its ups and downs, did express support for Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. If it is not a secret, what is your position?

[Surkov] I voted in favor of that decision. There are a number of substantial reasons—I will not go into detail now—which make me categorically opposed to the general secretary's resigning. At the same time I would like him to take account of a number of critical comments in his future work. That was the basis the plenum worked on when it extended Mikhail Sergeyevich its trust.

[Mamchur] How high is the party leader's rating among Army Communists?

[Surkov] The question has not been specially studied, but I do know that there is criticism. There is, for instance, the telegram from the Black Sea Fleet—on the results of the seminar of party committee secretaries and representatives of control committees. Communists express their dissatisfaction with a slackening of activity in the party work of the general secretary personally and the party leadership as a whole. Similar signals are coming from other regions too. Incidentally, serious problems were also raised in the speech delievered to the plenum by Admiral G. Khvatov, a member of the CPSU Central Committee.

We should draw conclusions from this too. The supreme political leadership should pay more attention to the Army and the Navy. The All-Army Party Committee will raise servicemen's problems at all levels. It has to be said, is already doing so. With the Ministry of Defense and other departments. The thrust of our proposals and comments, including those on the anticrisis program, is the defense of military men's interests and lawful rights.

[Mamchur] It is known that around 8,000 Army and Navy Communists have recently left the party....

[Surkov] That figure is correct only if combined with another: Since the 28th congress alone 35,000 of our comrades have been accepted into the CPSU. Another cause for optimism is the fact that the process of leaving the party is slowing down considerably.

Whether you belong to the party or not is a purely personal matter. And yet I cannot regard dispassionately those people who submit their resignation with scant consideration. Some I would not lend a hand to. They are people who bend with the wind, opportunists. The direction the wind is blowing from and what serves their advantage at the time are what count for them. How do I see it? If, say, your party makes mistakes, it is the duty of a basically decent person to help recitify those mistakes. For some reason I have not heard of such gestures. On the contrary. One person will slam the door after defending a doctoral dissertation funded by the party. Another on becoming a parliamentary leader... This is all, as I have said, to do with common decency.

[Mamchur] What is your attitude toward the slogan on the departyization of the Army?

[Surkov] During the report and election campaign my comrades and I had occasion to visit dozens of military units and party collectives. The question was not raised in a single one of them. What does that indicate?

It indicates that the CPSU enjoys real authority and influence in the Armed Forces, but our opponents want to destroy the party and make it voluntarily cede its position to other political forces. That is the whole secret purpose of their loud slogans about departyization. Yes, it would be a good thing if they defended their idea themselves! But look how ingeniously they play this card. You drew attention to the fact that the thesis of the departyization of the Armed Forces is not, say, the least of the striking miners' political demands. I sympathise and express complete solidarity with many of their economic demands, but I cannot understand: Is the departyization of the Army really the most important thing for the miners today? Will their lives really be easier if it is carried out?

It is as plain as day here that this slogan has been artificially introduced among the miners by political intriguers with the inflammatory, far-reaching intention of driving a serious wedge between the working class and the Army. Why am I speaking about this in such detail? If a miner reads these lines, let him understand that the military have enormous respect for their truly heroic labor, and many servicemen live no better than they do. But to demand that the military be deprived of basic constitutional rights—that is not at all a worker's way of doing things. When all is said and done, we too have our arguments and our character.

To get the country out of the mire, it is extremely important that the healthy forces in society, all those who are not indifferent to the fatherland's fate, unite. Regardless of political, religious, or other convictions. I think that Army communists can do a great deal for such consolidation.

[Mamchur] Mikhail Semenovich, people believed you in Armenia because they saw you in action. They saw the man. Then the communist, the general.... If you do not object, a few words about yourself.

[Surkov] My father went through the war as a private and then worked on a construction sites and at a plant until retirement. My mother was an inspector in a communal housing administration. My wife, Leonarda Tikhonovna, is a teacher. Neither her family nor mine has had any career officer or officer at all in it. I have two daughters: one is a student, the other goes to school. I started working at a plant at the age of 14 as an apprentice fitter. I operated a hoist at a construction site in Petrodvotrets. I was in charge of a Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League] committee and a youth detachment helping the militia. At the same time I studied nights at an engineering and economics institute. I was drafted into the Army when in the second year. I was a battery first sergeant when I was accepted into the party and was sent on courses for political workers. I did what I could to get out of it. But I was told: This is your first party assignment....

[Mamchur] Your final one, it would seem, is to be a Politburo member and head the Armed Forces' more than 1 million-strong party organization?

[Surkov] Seems that way....

## First All-Army Party Conference Reported

*PM2904125191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Apr 91 First Edition p 1*

[Unattributed report: "All-Army Party Committee: Realizing Ideas of Renewal"]

[Text] The materials and decisions of the first All-Army Party Conference constitute a political and practical base for ensuring the vigorous activity of all party organs and primary party organizations. The conference confirmed the political optimism of Army Communists and their confidence that, despite all the difficulties, the perestroyka of party work in the Armed Forces will progress, ensuring unity of will and action. This thought was a leitmotiv at a recent session of the All-Army Party Committee Bureau.

The report "On the Results of the First All-Army Party Conference and Priority Measures To Implement Its Decisions," which was delivered by Major General M. Surkov, secretary of the All-Army Party Committee, and the speeches by CPSU Central Committee senior official V. Namestnikov, Major General G. Batanov, Major General A. Morozov, Colonel A. Vozov, and others emphasized that at the party conference there was a long and frank discussion of ways to renew and democratize party work in the Army and Navy, to strengthen the CPSU organization in the USSR Armed Forces ideologically and organizationally, and to increase Communists' responsibility for the realization of the party's military policy at the present stage.

Priority measures to realize the decisions of the First All-Army Party Conference were defined. It was deemed expedient for all party organs to continue active work on the study and propaganda of the materials of the party conference to adopt everything of value and literally every proposal and thought that is out of the ordinary. It is important that the tone be set here not only by delegates but also by Communist leaders of the central apparatus and servicemen members of the CPSU Central Committee, the Union republic Communist Party Central Committees, and territorial party committees. Life itself, which is complex and contradictory, suggests that party committees of academies, higher educational institutions, and scientific research establishments set up nonstaff lecture groups including skilled propagandists and originally minded people. It is recommended to have them address Communists in military and labor collectives during April-June this year.

Specific proposals were made at the session for increasing the party's influence on questions of combat and mobilization readiness, personnel training, and the strengthening of organization, order, and discipline in the Army and Navy and on the progress of military reform. Party committees at all levels were instructed to analyze in May progress in fulfilling the 28th CPSU Congress resolution "On the Main Areas of the Party's Military Policy at the Present Stage."

A resolution of the All-Army Party Committee Bureau also outlined practical steps to activate the ideological life of party organizations and fill it with modern substance. This will make it possible to consolidate Communists on the basis of the idea of the socialist choice and loyalty to the country's leadership and the USSR Constitution.

Ways to realize the conference delegates' proposals on questions of the social and legal protection of servicemen, workers, employees, and members of their families were defined. It was emphasized that party committees at all levels must show initiative and make proposals for military councils and Communist leaders of rear services and construction and billeting organizations to examine as a priority questions of making the maximum use of local potential for removing tension in the social sphere and eliminating shortcomings in everyday, trade, and medical services for people in the light of the exacerbation of the situation caused by the increase in prices and the withdrawal of troops from Eastern European countries and Mongolia.

The bureau session examined ways to qualitatively improve the system of training, retraining, and education of party worker cadres and all categories of the party aktiv.

The theme of the struggle for the purity of the party's ranks and to surmount the inertia and apathy to which certain party collectives are prey was a leitmotiv of the report and the bureau members' speeches. This was also

reflected in the bureau's resolution: "It is deemed expedient to hold individual talks with Communists in all party organizations before the end of this year and to resolutely get rid of political hypocrites and those who find party duties a burden and fail to fulfill the CPSU Statutes."

At its session the All-Army Party Committee Bureau comprehensively examined the questions "On the Political Results of the USSR Referendum and the Conclusions and Tasks of Party Organizations in the USSR Armed Forces," "On the Practical Work of Army and Navy Party Organs in Organizing and Holding the Leninist Communist Subbotnik," on making changes to certain CPSU normative-methods documents, and a number of others. Corresponding resolutions and decisions were adopted. In particular, the bureau resolved to urge Army and Navy party organizations to give all possible support to the missile servicemen's initiative to transfer half of the funds earned in the subbotnik to enlarging and modernizing the V.I. Lenin Central Museum, and the rest to the fund to construct the Central Museum of the 1941-1945 Great Patriotic War on Poklonnaya Gora.

Colonel General N. Shlyaga, chief of the USSR Armed Forces Main Military-Political Directorate and USSR first deputy defense minister, participated in the work of the bureau and addressed it. He dwelt on problems of improving the mechanism of cooperation between military-political organs and party organizations. In his speech he also formulated key areas of ideological work.

### Gorbachev Speech at Conference

*OW2404045391 Moscow Central Television First Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 2230 GMT 6 Apr 91*

[Address by M.S. Gorbachev, President of the USSR and General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the First All-Army Party Conference in the Moscow Kremlin on 30 March—recorded; from the "Radar-TV" program]

[Text] The First All-Army Conference, that concluded the process of dividing the functions of military and political bodies and party organizations, which are now acquiring complete independence, ended its work in Moscow on 30 March. Delegates who spoke at the conference comprehensively reviewed topical problems of the vital activities of party organizations in the Armed Forces, and determined the main tasks of Army and Navy communists in the further deepening of perestroyka, strengthening the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as united federative socialist states, and tasks for concluding a Union treaty.

The delegates of the First All-Army Party Conference were addressed by M.S. Gorbachev, President of the USSR and General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

[Gorbachev] First of all I would like to express my attitude toward your conference. It is unequivocal. I greet it on behalf of the CPSU Central Committee and through you I greet all Army communists who have been entrusted with a big job by our people and our state.

I heard with interest what I could yesterday; your speeches at the conference. I do not want to go into details right now, but I would like to say that in principle I share their general trend. I share their general trend even in those cases when I disagree with certain points and do not accept certain assessments or opinions. If we judge by the discussion that has been going on here yesterday and today, the people that have been speaking are concerned by the situation in the country, in the state, and by its fate, by the situation in the country's Armed Forces and in our party.

Now this is the most important thing, insofar as the current situation permits us today, to subject everything that is happening in the country to an all-round analysis; to return to the lessons of the past; assess the nature of ongoing processes; and look into the future and analyze contemporary processes to determine where they may lead us. There can be different assessments here. I think that the value of this party conference lies precisely in the fact that everyone here is permeated with the same and most important thing, [a desire to see] that the native country, to put it simply, lives and the crises is overcome more rapidly in order to take the broad road of development and guarantee a peaceful life.

So I welcome the overall spirit of the conference, the patriotic direction and responsibility that can be heard here in all the conference delegates' speeches. I am a resolute opponent of attempts to drag the policy of departization into the Armed Forces by any means. Party organizations here in the country's Armed Forces, this very important institution of the state, bear enormous responsibility for maintaining the combat spirit and frame of mind of servicemen at the proper level. This is of decisive significance, both during peace time when military skills are being developed, and during times of trials. Now if this is absent then everything collapses, like in any task. A person weak in spirit loses his way, begins to panic, and then no weapons, no slogans, nothing will save him.

Criticizing the experience, the bitter and dramatic experience of realization of the socialist idea after October, we are not rejecting the socialist idea. It is a popular idea linked with justice, democracy, freedoms, and an understanding that the most valuable thing is man. All of this is a basis for renewing society proceeding from these fundamental principles. We have the results of the referendum. Some consider that the referendum solved nothing, that moreover, it had further complicated the situation. Well, we have a few hard heads like this while on the other hand we simply have some calculating people. Besides, before the referendum they appealed against... [changes thought] not to go to the referendum

or if taking part to vote no, insofar as it would mean approving the political line, supporting the President, the Cabinet, and so forth.

Now as soon as the people took part—86 percent of them of whom 76 percent voted for the Union—they began to back peddle: This does not mean that the people supported the Union, this does not mean that they supported the current power structure or the president, and so forth. This is simply a crowd of intriguers and demagogues. We must do our job. The fact that the people, in the most difficult situation, cast aside everything, the humiliation of lines, overexertion in production, ignored everything, and rose above it all and said: Yes, to the main question—for if this main question is not resolved everything else will be slowed down—how can this be ignored and how can this be lightly discarded. This is the peoples' position, after all. There are such opinions.

The sentiment of most of the republics is to go ahead with the signing of the Union treaty as quickly as possible. This can be seen from conversations. It was only yesterday that I held a conference on this issue to which comrades from the Supreme Soviet, the Cabinet, and representatives of science and the public were invited. The discussion followed this trend and information on sentiments and proposals coming from all the republics was summarized. We will act.

Now what does this mean? I can see that an opportunity already exists to carry out the main work as early as some time in April, and by the beginning of May, by Victory Day, to score another victory by signing the Union treaty. This would be wonderful, and we have all grounds for this.

(?This is) the real difficulty in the transformation and it rests on our redundancy [zatsiklennost], on the deformation of our consciousness, and we have finally seen our society the way it really is. Previously, it was monolithic and unified, without even so much as a crack or a blemish, like a crystal. Suddenly, something incredible appeared from this crystal? No. So we must get over this. This may be the most difficult test. If we endure it, renewal will take place, as will the formation of a rule-of-law and democratic state in which people feel like people, where institutions play their role with the firm support of the law, and function on the basis of the law, where everybody lives with confidence, and so forth.

This is the most difficult thing, this is very difficult. Our search has not yet been crowned with success. We are searching for it now, and as soon as we approached an understanding of the fact that democracy itself has significance as something of value and will bear fruit for us, only when power will function reliably with the support of law—effective power, firm power—without this, it is not democracy, but something like what we have now encountered with you. I understand this, I understand that there is a miscalculation here. We feverishly do things and often take half measures, half measures because we have no time to fully reason out these questions since events force us to somehow take the situation in hand.

I see all this and, I admit, this is not the most seemly thing. Yet, they say things should be reasoned out and so forth. This is all clear to me... it should be reasoned out. Generally speaking, I could give some advice myself, even on military matters, quite a bit of it, although I try to rely on experts, on military people, coordinating their judgments with our policy—both domestic and foreign—security, and so forth. I see this as my role, and do not claim the right to give direct commands as to how to live and carry on military affairs.

As a matter of fact, I shall not be taking courses from Comrade Makashov—I saw him sitting out there somewhere. He said there should be two- or three-week courses for presidents or for anybody who has anything do with the Army. Am I right, no? Then, I ought to tell you, you too should stop advising me on politics and first undertake courses. Ah, so you see. So, let us be frank with one another.

What do we have today? An obvious struggle is under way between political forces who are supported by various strata. As a political struggle, as a form of competition, this is quite normal. It conforms with political pluralism. We should accept this reality and political struggle as a normal manifestation. Now, from this we should simply draw conclusions for our own activities, for the party. Now, if in some cases it is the dominant power in corresponding institutions representing the party, we must look at all this in a mature way and not imagine that everything we have today has been given to us forever. I think this belief exists, that what we have is not simply given to us forever, for perpetual use or for a 100-year lease. No! This must be proven through democratic processes and in democratic forms every time. Now, to do this, not a single day or hour can be lost. We must act in this direction to augment our policy, which would promote changes for the better in society. The fact that the CPSU must operate in the context of reality stems from this. It must prove its role, propose its programs, programs of practical activities, and carry out the corresponding political and organizational work every day, everywhere, and exert an influence on society in the required direction proceeding from the program tasks we have before us.

Talking about all this, comrades, I would now like to especially approach the issue—I have made a note to this effect here, although I have left it to the end—of the Armed Forces of the USSR. We must look at their situation and role in contemporary society in the context of internal processes, as well as processes taking place in the modern world, and first of all from the position that security is the result of the influence of many factors working together. This includes the economic might and scientific and technical potential of society. It includes

the political and social stability of society, and it includes the armed forces, suitably organized and equipped and capable of solving the task of ensuring the country's reliable security. It also includes an active foreign policy that ensures the establishment of favorable external conditions for the life of our state and the solution of all tasks.

We have begun an active foreign policy that leads to disarmament. We have begun changing the role of the defense sector. Through scientific and technical progress and by reforming society and starting new forms of economic life, we have begun giving society a new dynamism, creating the economic and technical might that will serve and turn into new living conditions for the people and the army too, by fulfilling army requirements. In certain issues we are not solving these requirements satisfactorily—quantitatively, yes, although even quantitatively we are not solving them. In particular, there is a lag in some directions that today—the Persian Gulf showed us a thing or two here—must be solved at a different level.

So, we must have dependable Armed Forces—within the framework of our new doctrine—Armed Forces in possession of the necessary equipment; therefore, there can be no light or superficial attitude toward this matter. The Army is the state, the state is the Army. It is a most enormous undertaking. It is directly linked with the present and the future of the state. Questions were raised and attention was drawn to the fact that the president should concern himself with seeing that the parcel of laws concerning the Army be passed more quickly. This is being done comrades, but I must say that these are all very fundamental questions. There are so many alternative proposals and critical remarks. Questions about concern for our service members and about arms for our army will continue to be examined as the most important state issues, and communists must be totally clear on this. [applause]

I repeat that we are doing this based on principle—that the country must have Armed Forces capable of reliably guaranteeing the security of the state and maintaining peace. I would like to emphasize this once more. For my part, as the president, I keep all these matters under supervision. Critical remarks are being made here on this and on other scores—what we have done, what we have overlooked, and what we have lost. I think that there is no need for me to repeat myself, because very many lightweight arguments have already been suggested. They have been made and ascribed to this or that person; you see, he led us up the garden path, the other lost us in the woods, the third...and so on and so forth.

Overall, they do not know the process, how it all transpires and is done; however, we have people sitting here who can attest to the fact that every step in these matters—foreign policy, security, the disarmament process, the building up of the Armed Forces—every step is the result of research by institutes concerned with this, it is the discussion of corresponding competent bodies, and so forth.

So, to think that some kind of amateurs have popped up here who are deciding these questions in an amateurish way, is a serious error, a serious error. I am only saying this to emphasize once more that everything concerning the Armed Forces will be examined thoroughly. We are now very concerned to ensure that perestroyka in the Armed Forces, in conjunction with the reform that is essentially already under way, and everything involved with disarmament is expedited, and of course, that no losses are allowed from the standpoint of security and from the standpoint of the organization of our Armed Forces. In particular, living conditions concern us more than anything. Regretfully, things are not progressing simply. We have very serious neglect and intolerable situations here. I will not burden you once more with unnecessary assurances, but I assure you that we will do everything so that in the course of this process, in the conditions of the market, the Army feels the concern of the state.

## CPSU Military Commission Discusses Conversion

*91UM0619A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Apr 91 First Edition p 1*

[Report by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Colonel G. Barnev: "The Working Facets of Conversion"]

[Text] A scheduled session of the CPSU Central Committee's Military Policy Commission took place on 26 April. The session considered two items. Reports on the first item, "On the Work of the Udmurt Party Organization in Assisting the Implementation of the State Program for Defense Industry Conversion at Region Enterprises and Ensuring the Social Protection of Workers," were presented by N.I. Sapozhnikov, secretary of the Udmurt Republic CPSU Committee, and L.L. Nikiforov, chairman of the subcommission on party support for military-technical policy and conversion.

The commission's choice of Udmurtiya was not accidental. Almost 70 percent of this region's industrial potential is in defense industry enterprises, and almost 60 percent of republic workers are employed there. Conversion-related processes are visible and tangible in the region. Suffice it to say that in 1988 defense production comprised 69.7 percent of the republic's total volume of production, while production for civilian needs and that of consumer goods comprised only 30.3 percent; during the last two years, the share of defense industry declined to 46 percent, while the production of general use and consumer goods rose to 53 percent.

This is not an easy process, and party organizations make considerable efforts to overcome negative consequences which initially accompany structural changes in the national economy. Now the communists' efforts are concentrated on working out the republic program of conversion.

A report on the second item, "On Some Conclusions Stemming From the Results of the Military Draft in 1990," was presented by Colonel General N.I. Shlyaga, USSR first deputy minister of defense and head of the Main Military-Political Administration of the USSR Armed Forces.

Among other participants in the sessions were representatives of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR president's apparatus, the USSR cabinet of ministers, the CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission, the Central Committee of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party, and of union ministries and departments.

O.D. Baklanov, head of the commission, presided over the commission session.

## Baltic Republics

### Baltic Deputies Attend Human Rights Meeting

*LD1405214691 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0430 GMT 14 May 91*

[Excerpt] During the weekend an international conference in The Hague started its work on human rights problems in the 50 years of Soviet power in the Baltics and their possible aftereffects following the liquidation of the annexation. Taking part in the conference are delegations from the interested parties, from the Baltic republics and the Soviet Union, as well as specialists in human and national rights from Western universities.

Latvia has three representatives: deputies Stepicevs, Kirsteins, and Ulme from the Supreme Council. Also taking part is the representative of the Latvian Republic in Moscow, Janis Peters. As Aleksandrs Kirsteins said in a television interview before leaving for Holland, the conference may be a chance for agreement to be reached between the Baltic and Soviet sides in viewing the events of 1940 as an annexation. [passage omitted]

### Latvians To Request Soviet Troop Withdrawal

*LD1405145691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1017 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga 14 May (TASS)—Latvian representatives intend to include the issue of the USSR Armed Forces on the agenda of the second round of talks with the USSR delegation scheduled for 23 May in Riga.

The Latvian Supreme Soviet Commission for Defense and Internal Affairs has worked out a package of proposals on this topic, reported Talavs Jundzis, the commission's chairman, speaking on television on Monday. They include a proposal that USSR troops be withdrawn from Latvian territory within two years; until then, the temporary status of their stay be established with adherence to two principles—noninterference in the republic's internal affairs and observance of its laws. Jundzis asserted that "the republic will demand compensation for the damage done by the Army including the return of contributions to the USSR military budget." In his words, the republic "retains the right to set up its own national formations and to protect it borders with its own forces."

### Latvia's Aboltinsh Shrugs Off Moscow's Threats

*AU1505095591 Duesseldorf HANDELSBLATT in German 14 May 91 p 8*

[Bernd Ziesemer report: "Riga Makes Light of Moscow's Threats"]

[Text] Riga, 13 May—Latvian Economics Minister Yanis Aboltinsh considers the latest Soviet threats against the Baltic states to be mostly ineffective. If Moscow really wants to change trade with Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania to world market prices, the Soviet Government will harm itself, the Latvian politician said in an interview with HANDELSBLATT.

Aboltinsh sees the latest statements by the Soviet Government only as a further futile means of exerting political pressure to force the Baltic states to sign a new Union treaty. According to Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Shcherbakov, the Baltic States are supposed to pay for all imports from the Soviet Union in hard currency as of this summer, if they stick to their course of independence.

The Latvian economics minister expects "difficulties but not a disaster," if this should really happen: "If we are supposed to pay in hard currency for Soviet crude oil, Moscow must also pay in foreign currency for our deliveries." The government in Riga, however, is convinced that "a compromise is unavoidable." After all, neither the Soviet Union nor the Baltic states are interested in changing their entire foreign trade to foreign currency overnight.

Aboltinsh recalled that many industrial enterprises in Latvia are producing goods and subcontractor products that are urgently needed in the Soviet Union. Soviet crude oil exports and wheat imports are loaded and unloaded in the Latvian ports. If worse comes to worse, Latvia will impose customs duties on this transfer of goods. The Soviet Government will probably come to an agreement on clearing procedures with the Baltic states, as was the case with the Eastern European states in the past. Latvia has already concluded binding barter deals with many Soviet republics, particularly with the Russian Federation.

The Latvian politician sees Moscow's threats as something positive to a certain extent, even though he comes out "against mixing politics and the economy." With Shcherbakov's statements, the Soviet Government is practically recognizing Latvia as a sovereign state. Of course, at the moment it is impossible to tell when the "transitional period" to Latvia's complete independence can be concluded. In economic terms, all Baltic states will certainly continue to depend on trade with the Soviet Union for years.

Nevertheless, Aboltinsh expressed optimism about Latvia's chances of unlinking itself from the profound economic crisis in the Soviet Union. At the moment there are indications that production in the northernmost Baltic republic is stabilizing. After a decline of 6 to 8 percent during the first two months of this year, in March a moderate economic growth of 1.2 percent was achieved. "Our enterprises are not mammoth companies, they are more flexible and are starting to adjust to the new conditions," the economics minister said.

In his view, however, an independent Latvian currency is not yet possible "in the foreseeable future." A hasty introduction of the Lat—this is the name of the new banknotes, as has already been decided—would lead

directly to a "financial disaster." Aboltinsh could also imagine a common currency for all three Baltic republics. Unfortunately, the economic policy of the Baltic states still has some "birth pangs," particularly widespread egotism: "Without our own currency there is no independent state, many legislators think."

Since the declaration of sovereignty exactly one year ago, Latvia has passed about 50 new economic laws. Over the next few months, the government will primarily deal with the privatization of housing and small companies, Aboltinsh insists. Unfortunately, there is a lack of qualified experts to implement privatization more quickly. The government also has problems with the remnants of "bolshevik psychology" among the population. Therefore, Aboltinsh is hoping for help from the West to accelerate the process of privatization.

"We do not need food packages from the West," the economics minister said, "but mainly know-how." In his view, it would also be useful if state guarantees were given for western investments in Latvia. Joint ventures are very important for the further economic development of the country. After all, in Latvia the Communists "spent 50 years destroying morally and partly also physically all people with an entrepreneurial spirit."

### Latvia Works Out Grain Production Program

*LD1405212791 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0430 GMT 14 May 91*

[Text] The Latvian Ministry of Agriculture has worked out a national program for grain production. It anticipates increasing the overall grain harvest by up to 2 million tonnes in weight by 1995. Even by realizing all the stipulations for expanding grain production and achieving such a result, Latvia will still have to buy 1 million tonnes of grain a year. To protect the republic in the event of a cessation of grain supplies from other republics and states, the Government of the Republic of Latvia has adopted a resolution to create a reserve fund for 300,000 tonnes of grain. A reserve fund of the same size is also being formed for fodder grain.

### Latvian Penal System Could Lose Conscripts

*PM1405141991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 May 91 Union Edition p 2*

["Direct Line" report by Irina Litvinova: "Jails without Guards"]

[Text] Riga—Jails without guards—that is what could happen in Latvia if the latest army draft is disrupted in the republic.

Detainees in Latvia's corrective labor institutions are wondering: Will they all be released in a few months or will there be an unplanned large-scale amnesty? Because at the end of May or start of June the republic's penal colonies and jails may be left unguarded.

Until now an escort regiment of USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] internal troops has "stood guard." They escorted prisoners to the Supreme Court, took them to penal colonies inside and outside the republic, and ferried them from remand centers to jail. Both the officers and soldiers of the regiment, they believed, were "working for the republic" even though they were paid from the Union budget to which Latvia no longer contributes money.

The new authorities' attitude toward the Soviet Army has also affected those who serve in the escort regiment. Despite the existing legislative acts of the USSR Council of Ministers, apartments are no longer being distributed, for example (the money for a proportional share in construction has been allocated). It is not enough that the officers have suffered housing and other problems, they may soon be "commanders without an army": Successive army drafts from the republic have been disrupted and the regiment may be left without soldiers.

The officers' appeals to Council of Ministers Chairman I. Godmanis and Internal Affairs Minister A. Vaznis were fruitless. Then the rumors began that the escort regiment is being taken off guard duty on 1 May. A news conference was urgently convened at the Supreme Soviet, where the most patriotic deputies vowed to join the guard themselves. No other solutions to the problem were proposed.

As I was told at the regiment, its servicemen will go on performing their duties even though they are deemed "representatives of a foreign state" here. If the republic's draft does not take place in May-June, it is possible that the deputies will indeed have to exchange their legislative work for military guard duty in jails and penal colonies.

### Rally Shows Declining Support for 'Sajudis'

*PM1505084891 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 May 91 Second Edition p 2*

["Hot Line" report by Yu. Stroganov: "Speaking the Language of Hatred"]

[Text] Vilnius—I do not want to claim that the Lithuanian "Sajudis" legislators dotted the "i's" and crossed the "t's" of their aspirations at precisely this rally—we have known about their aims for a long time. These aims are not secret either: To tear Lithuania away from the USSR by any means. Nevertheless, at the rally in Vilnius's Vingis Park, the words uttered by K. Motieka, deputy chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet, fluttered like a hatred-colored banner over the crowd, forcing everybody to listen intently to what they meant, as if they half-lifted the veil on historical truths of three years ago, when "Sajudis," the Lithuanian Movement for Perestroyka, was just being conceived.

"Our task was to overthrow the Soviet power that everyone hated," he stated, "and we did it."

Although the number of people at the rally was several times less than in previous years, when some claimed that almost all Lithuania used to gather in Vingis Park when "Sajudis" gave the call, the new harvest may turn out to be less generous but no less bitter. The political soil has been more than abundantly fertilized by a long-term anti-Soviet, antiarmy, and anticommunist campaign.

There is also the ongoing argument, which is complex as a result of many years' accretions and distortions, about the future of Lithuania, about how it should develop, and about the property located on its territory. Whose is it—the Union's or the republic's? In which cases? The lawyers have not been given the opportunity to cross swords in attempting to sort out the hitherto unprecedented situation. Since 11 March last year we have heard that there is no longer a Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]; therefore, the Union is a foreign state with all the consequences that this entails. Talks between Moscow and Vilnius might gradually have unraveled the more complex points of contradiction, but here I analyze the disturbing words of Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Chairman V. Landsbergis about agents, bloody casualties, a legion of foreigners, bandits, invaders, and so on, and I think: People who really have no taste for Soviet power or the Union, or who are simply governed by their emotions, may succumb entirely to appeals made by the head of the legislature at a rally: Come again to the buildings that are the subject of a difficult and disagreeable argument. Bearing in mind that these buildings are guarded by the Soviet militia. Why call people there? Who are they going to argue with, and what about? With an armed soldier? How? What is the purpose of this appeal? Will these people really help to take the heat out of the confrontation by going there, or will they not just make it worse? Can V. Landsbergis's question at the rally—"Shall we go—100,000 people—to reclaim our borders?"—really help to resolve this state problem?

At the rally A. Butkevicius, general director of the territorial Defense Department, compared the incorporation of Lithuania into the USSR with the armed aggression of Hitler's Germany against a number of states.

How complex today is the moral question for a Lithuanian youth reading the newspapers on the subject of military service in the ranks of the Soviet Army. The serious conflict over the matter of the USSR Armed Forces draft has been going on since last year. Here too it is a case of more fuel to the fire:

"I am also campaigning for all Lithuania's young men not to go into the Army," appealed A. Butkevicius, who was then more explicit: "Into the Soviet Army."

Nevertheless this rally differed a great deal from previous ones, and the smaller number of participants was a quantitative indicator of qualitative changes. If the cry of hatred was formerly directed only at the Communists, the "Sajudis" legislators have now identified the republic's other parties as enemies of the Lithuanian people.

The split in the formerly monolithic movement for Lithuanian independence is deep. The organizers of the rally, a number of so-called "right-wing" movements of the nationalist persuasion, will strive to push on toward their goal along the path of confrontation with the Union and hatred for their eastern neighbor. Sober-minded people, however, can see the hopelessness of this approach; they prefer reasonableness and calm dialogue to fury. Many Lithuanian philosophers, writers, and scientists have frequently expressed the feeling that it is time to cross over to a policy of compromises, to stop the "witch-hunt" and the ceaseless search for enemies. As a result of saying this they too have been declared enemies. Curses are already being heaped not just upon the heads of Communists, but also of people who have joined together in the liberal-centrist bloc "Forum for the Future of Lithuania."

What, then, were the aims that the rally's organizers were pursuing today? The view of M. Burokevicius, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee and CPSU Central Committee Politburo member:

"The convening of the rally and the extreme aggressiveness we heard in the speeches of the republic's present leaders can be explained by the fact that they are losing their authority among the main bulk of the Lithuanian population in view of their ineffective domestic and foreign policy, and they need to reaffirm their popularity and support."

The rally showed that among a section of the population V. Landsbergis's politics are popular like they were before. The only thing is, this section is getting smaller. Maybe this is happening because people have understood that you cannot speak the language of hatred all the time.

## Lithuanian Official on Goods Available For Sale

*LD1405151491 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 14 May 91*

[Excerpt] I think that a report by government adviser Ceslovas Jursenas will be of interest to you. It mentions which goods will be sold at commercial prices.

[Begin Jursenas recording] A proposal by the Ministry of Trade is approved to continue the order of selling food products in May and June of this year, with the exception of alcoholic beverages on single special purpose coupons. City and rayon councils must ensure that only thos nonfood goods are sold through the workers' collectives and social (?guardianship) institutions the stocks of which make it possible to allocate them for each inhabitant. This applies to knitwear, socks, stockings, men's shirts, some haberdashery goods, and cosmetics.

The government also decided that from 15 May the nonfood goods in greater demand, like refrigerators, vacuum cleaners, washing machines, other electric goods in short supply, sewing and knitting machines, television sets, tape recorders, cameras, and furniture are sold—until 1 July, until other forms of organizing trade are introduced—to the republic's inhabitants at commercial prices and without limitation. Meanwhile, for agricultural workers who sell meat and milk to the state, these goods are to be sold at noncommercial prices. [passage omitted] [end recording]

### Vilnius Protests Radio, TV Center Occupation

*LD1405165391 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International in English 2130 GMT 13 May 91*

[Text] Today marks four months since the abortive partocracy putsch in Lithuania. More than 1,000 people gathered tonight in front of the Soviet army-occupied radio and TV center in Vilnius to express their protest against the aggression.

As is known, the putschists seized the radio and TV center and the TV tower using brutal military force and causing deaths of peaceful civilians.

Now the intruders stay in the buildings and spread their Stalinist propaganda from the occupied buildings. Their programs are seen and heard within the radius of several dozen km around Vilnius only. About 2,000 journalists and technical staff cannot return to their workplaces in the occupied buildings.

Speaking at the protest rally today, the Lithuanian Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius defined the occupied radio and TV center as an institution of the communist partocracy and the military. Referring to those who are working in the occupied buildings now, the prime minister said they had false illusions that they had won. Actually, the more actively they defend the Soviet system the sooner they will suffer a defeat, said Gediminas Vagnorius.

Director of the Lithuanian television Algirdas Kauspedas informed the manifestants about the results of a recent public opinion poll. Only 3 percent of the Lithuanian population watched TV programs broadcast from the occupied TV center, while the index of the trust for those programmes is minus 75 percent.

By way of comparison, 64 percent of potential TV viewers of Lithuania watch programs of the independent Lithuanian television, broadcast from the studio in the parliament building in the capital Vilnius and from the second largest city Kaunas. The trust rating of these broadcasts is plus 63 percent.

### Lithuanian President Pays Visit to Chicago

*OW1505090391 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1533 GMT 14 May 91*

[Text] On the latest stage of his visit to the USA, the Lithuanian president Vytautas Landsbergis yesterday told a press-conference in Chicago that he believed relations between his republic and the USSR were changing. He urged the U.S. government to play a more active role saying that this would "ensure that the present conflict was resolved successfully." He said that it was impossible to say how long it would take to resolve fate of the Baltic republics, but contended that much of the present uncertainty was essentially due to the reluctance of the international community to intervene.

When asked what kind of help was expected from the USA, Landsbergis replied that the best way of easing tensions would be to offer the Baltic republics a chance to participate in the developing security and cooperation processes in Europe.

### Meets With Emigres

*LD1405142191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 14 May 91*

[Text] A few words about the visit to Chicago by Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis.

Vytautas Landsbergis held a news conference in this U.S. city yesterday, home of the largest Lithuanian emigre community. This was the first news conference after his meeting with President Bush. We already reported about this conference, citing reports by Voice of America. I will recall only the most important passages. Vytautas Landsbergis thought that a turning point in relations with the Soviet Union is approaching. He also noted that President Bush stressed several times during the meeting in the White House that the United States is on the side of the Baltic countries. Vytautas Landsbergis also voiced his hope that the U.S. policy toward the Baltic states would become more active shortly.

Today Vytautas Landsbergis will meet in Chicago with representatives of Jewish organizations and the leaders of the Polish-American community.

## RSFSR

### Continuing Reportage on Yeltsin's CSFR Visit

### Discusses Future Ties With Dubcek

*LD1305185191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1719 GMT 13 May 91*

[Text] Prague, 13 May (TASS)—CSFR Federal Assembly Chairman Alexander Dubcek today received Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet.

Having expressed his thanks for the invitation to visit Czechoslovakia, Yeltsin spoke of the efforts being made by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet to aid perestroyka within society, and also of the striving to join the European process of integration.

Dubcek briefed his guest on the current situation in the CSFR and on the Federal Assembly's work. In light of

present European and world trends, we want to establish closer cooperation, he stressed. Agreement was expressed regarding the fact that it is necessary to look for ways to overcome present-day economic problems. Opportunities are now arising for agreements to be concluded between the republics, providing for a mutually advantageous exchange of goods, the construction of breweries in the RSFSR, and interaction in constructing other projects.

Dubcek and Yeltsin expressed confidence that the planned negotiations will be successful for both sides. Boris Pankin, USSR ambassador to the CSFR, was present at the meeting.

After the conversation, Yeltsin, accompanied by Dubcek, laid flowers at the monument to St. Wenceslas, and he walked across Wenceslas Square and chatted with the people of Prague. The chairman of the RSFSR legislature said they spoke about the past, which needs to be evaluated, but mainly discussed future relations, as both Czechoslovaks and Russians want to be good citizens within the European home. Yeltsin recalled that in the past there were good things in bilateral relations, and that he, as chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, is trying to restore them. What is meant, above all, is trade, especially in traditional products, in which the Russian Federation continues to be interested.

### Meets Havel, Conveys Greetings

*LD1305221491 Moscow TASS in English 2200 GMT 13 May 91*

[Text] Prague May 14 TASS—President Vaclav Havel of Czechoslovakia met on Monday with visiting Russian President Boris Yeltsin. Their more than an hour-long conversation focused on three main subjects. The two political leaders exchanged information about the situation in their republics and expressed understanding that the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and the Russian Federation had much in common in overcoming vestiges of the totalitarian system and the creation of new democratic structures.

Havel spoke about problems of the political life which has not yet been stabilized. Yeltsin noted that earlier this spring proper opposition was mounted to a right-wing wave. Russia provided the Soviet president with a left-wing support and the situation is now being gradually stabilized.

Yeltsin and Havel stressed the importance of direct Czechoslovak- Russian links which do not run counter but supplement relations between the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia.

Much attention was given to aspects of economic cooperation. It was noted that Russia would play an ever-growing role and because of this it is necessary to begin working out specific cooperation programmes aimed at overcoming economic difficulties. Possibilities for launching joint ventures were discussed.

Boris Yeltsin conveyed to Vaclav Havel greetings from President Mikhail Gorbachev.

After the conversation, Yeltsin told journalists that he had met Havel for the third time. During their previous meetings, they exchanged information about the democratization processes in Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union.

Today's conversation, Yeltsin said, differed in character and was held in a different atmosphere. If earlier all kinds of brakes were applied to democratization in Russia, presently relations between the centre and republics begin to be stabilized.

### Comments on Visit Results

*LD1405223191 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2000 GMT 14 May 91*

[Report by "Vesti" correspondent Yevgeniy Kiselev from Prague and Bratislava on activities of Russian "leader" Boris Yeltsin, including recorded remarks made by Yeltsin at CSFR Federal Assembly on 14 May, and recorded interview in Bratislava with Yeltsin; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] [Kiselev] The central event of today, the second day of the visit, was Yeltsin's speech in the Federal Assembly, the legislature of Czechoslovakia. The very fact that such a speech took place is very significant. Being offered this rostrum is virtually the highest honor that foreign statesmen are given in Prague.

At the same time, as some analysts note, here in Prague, in Czechoslovak political circles, there is a certain cautiousness with regard to the Union as a whole and to Russia. The heavy burden of the past and the events of 1968 still have their effect.

In the opinion of a number of observers, Yeltsin's speech was largely a program speech. In particular, he set out the concept of the foreign policy of a sovereign Russia within a future renewed Union.

[Yeltsin] Let me say clearly: Russia's partners will not be faced with a choice between the Union and Russia. On the contrary. The development of relations with the Union today presupposes a dialogue with both the central leadership and the republics.

[Kiselev] Today, in the Federal Assembly of Czechoslovakia, joint documents were signed—a declaration on the principles of reciprocal relations and cooperation between the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic and Czechoslovakia, and a protocol on cooperation between the Ministries of Foreign Affairs of Russia and the CSFR. Today, too, Yeltsin had a meeting in Prague with the Czech leadership and, after a flight to Bratislava and a look around the town of Bratislava, with the leaders of Slovakia.

A question from Russian Television's News Service. Boris Nikolayevich, what benefit will Russia and the Russians gain from the results of your visit to Czechoslovakia?

[Yeltsin] Today, we agreed to sign an agreement on deliveries of grain, meat, and butter which exists here on the market, so to say, in abundance; and you know the situation in our country among Russians.

In addition, Czechoslovakia is experiencing difficulties in selling other products which are very necessary to us today. Therefore, this declaration will be followed by agreements and subsequently by a treaty between Russia and Czechoslovakia.

### Reportage on Yeltsin Visit to Czechoslovaki

*WA1405170791*

For reportage on the visit by Boris Yeltsin, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet chairman, to Czechoslovakia, including reports on his talks with President Vaclav Havel and Federal Assembly Chairman Alexander Dubcek, see the Czechoslovakia section of the 14 May East Europe DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

### Yeltsin, Khasbulatov Attend Presidium Session

*LD1305204591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 13 May 91*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A routine meeting of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium was held today. Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin and Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov conducted the meeting. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, presented the program of the RSFSR Government on stabilizing the economy and the transition to market relations. After an exchange of views, a decision was made which, taking account of the remarks of the RSFSR Council of Ministers expressed at the meeting jointly with members of the Presidium, proposed a five-day period of further work on the programme, after which it will be sent to members of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and by 21 May to publish it in the press.

Some draft laws that had been recommended for consideration at the meeting of the republic Supreme Soviet were also discussed.

Organizational and technical matters relating to preparations for the fourth Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, and the election of the president of Russia and the mayor of the city of Moscow were considered. It was considered expedient to hold a congress of judges of the Russian Federation in Moscow in the fall of this year.

Other matters of republican state life were also discussed.

### Opening of Russian TV Service; Logo Reported

*LD1305172991*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program in Russian at 1359 GMT on 13 May announces that the Russian Television Service is about to begin.

The logo for this service is then shown. The logo consists of the Cyrillic letters "PTP" unfolding on the screen. The Russian red, blue and white tricolor threaded its way left to right through the letters, its central portion advancing toward the camera to leave the top half of the screen white and the bottom half blue, the red horizontal strip disappearing altogether. The words "Rossiyskoye Televideniye" (Russian Television) then appeared, blue "Rossiyskoye" on white background in the top half and white "Televideniye" on blue in the bottom half.

The station, identifying itself as "Russian Television", at 1401 GMT on 13 May continues its transmission with comments by O.B. Dobrodeyev, captioned as "Director of Russian Television;" A. Nekhoroshev, chief news editor of Radio Rossii; and S.A. Podgorbunskiy, captioned as "Director of Television." These three are shown seated on a couch in a foyer.

Dobrodeyev says: "And so, from today, at 2000 and 2300 in the evenings (1700 and 2000 GMT), you will all become viewers of our news program, a program that we have named "Vesti" (News). I hope that this program will come into every home, and that it will become popular, and that it is from our program that you will find out first about the main news of the day. We do not want to lecture anybody, we do not want to provide any kind of prescriptions in our very difficult lives today. At the same time, we hope that our program will become a fulcrum on which each of you will be able to count this difficult life. So, from today, the Vesti program goes out at 2000 and 2300.

"Now, if we are talking about news from our Russian TV and Radio Company, this did not begin today, in fact, news, the launch of the news, was done by the programs of Radio Rossii five months ago. Here is Aleksandr Nekhoroshev, Radio Rossii's chief news editor."

Nekhoroshev says: "Today is both a happy and a sad one for me. I am grieving because we have ceased to have a monopoly of the air waves; the child of whose birth we were warned is at last being born before our very eyes, and it largely depends on you, dear viewers, what kind of child this will be. Taking advantage of the occasion, I would like to express immense gratitude to our esteemed listeners, who have educated us radio journalists throughout these fives months, and also educated the TV journalists who have participated in the work of the Radio Rossii's news service. I think we shall make use of all the fine advice that you have given, and what the programs are like will now depend largely upon you, upon us and upon the situation that develops. I am very grateful to everybody for your attention to our programs;

I very much hope that despite the emergence of TV, you will not forget that Radio Rossii and its news service are on the air every day."

Podgorbunskiy then says: "Sasha has thanked his radio listeners, and has very cleverly put in an advertisement, I understand, you have already learned to do this, but we are going on the air with Russian television with a certain feeling of timidity. Why? Because it seems to me that we somehow missed our fated hour somewhere, so much has been said about how Russia ought to have its own television, it has been awaited for so long, that we are now trembling at the expectation that we have to justify the hopes which viewers are pinning on us. Well, I reckon that the journalists and editors and other production staff who have joined us will do everything they can to justify these hopes."

Dobrodeyev then says to camera: "Another request for you: Don't be hard on us. We are only just beginning, the child is just being born. From today there is Russia's television for you every day."

The station, identifying itself as "Russian Television," at 1405 GMT on 13 May continues its transmission with a video of street scenes, followed by a clip of TV journalists breaking a plate against the wall of the TV building—a traditional way of wishing good luck.

A.G. Lysenko, captioned as general director of All-Russian TV and Radio Broadcasting Company, is then shown seated in an office, grasping a shard from the plate broken for good luck, then putting it in his pocket. He says: "We hope that the programs which we will be broadcasting will be a valuable souvenir for the viewers, one of their hearts, not their pockets, and that we will provide them with further food for thought, for their hearts, and that we should in no way try to tell them how to live or try to deceive them. I would like to believe that, and I would like to believe that however inconvenient our hours may be, viewers will seek it out and switch on the (Central TV) second program, and say, today I saw this, that, and the other on Russian television. Because if we hear these words standing in a line, which is where the biggest gatherings of people are these days in our country, then we will be able to believe that we have done our job. We shall try. As in the film that we all loved so much, "Mukhtar will do his best," so, like Mukhtar, we shall all try, I think. There is just one difficulty, probably—that there is no (?map available), that we are at a crossroads. Go to the right, and there is nothing but trouble, go left, and there are different troubles. Go forwards—and you still do not know whether you will escape unscathed or not, at the end of the day. So what path do we choose that will not lead us into the more that we are all stuck in at the moment? To this end, probably, for all of us who have arrived here, and had a hard time getting here, it was difficult to decide, we will all have to work, to work and pay heed to our consciences. We have probably lost the habit of doing this, and now we will have to learn afresh.

"Well, these are all unhappy things, but when you are starting your work, you want to talk about jolly things, and jolliness is connected with good fortune. And good fortune is particularly connected with success in our days. And so, since I am a superstitious person, I would like to wish all of us, including myself, success. (picks up large dice from his desk). Let us try it—if I throw a six, that means it will be a success." (he throws a six)

This station introductory sequence ends at 1409 gmt. It is followed by an advertisement, then by a program of folk music.

## Chairman Issues Statement

*PM1405144591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 May 91 Second Edition p 6*

["Statement" by Oleg Poptsov, chairman of the All-Russian State Television and Radio Company, on 13 May to S. Oganyan; place not specified: "Oleg Poptsov: 'We Are All in the Same Boat Called the Fatherland'"]

[Text] Yesterday, Monday 13 May, saw the debut of Russian Television, a hitherto unknown entity.

Oleg Poptsov, chairman of the All-Russian State Television and Radio Company, was glued to his television the whole day. That was how he issued a statement at a PRAVDA correspondent's request, without taking his eyes off the "box."

[Poptsov] Man's consciousness and his rush onward begin when he begins to ask and seek answers to questions. Today we must all learn to do this and learn to call ourselves to account. We must be merciless with ourselves.

Appealing to viewers, I said that they should not judge us severely. What does that mean? It means, be severe in your judgment, but pass judgment without forgetting that you yourselves will be judged. I am in favor of reciprocal judgment, but the kind of judgment that will enrich and not destroy one another. We must learn to portray love. The situation is such that we are more willing to hate—hatred is all around....

Today I received a telephone call from a newspaper and was asked with alarm: Will Russian Television be anti-communist? I replied that this was gibberish. And to PRAVDA, which I have read since I was 12 years old, my reply is that Russian Television will be a television company against lies. It will be a television company whose broadcasts endeavor to broaden the concept of the world. We may not do this as PRAVDA does. But that is not so terrible, after all.

Today, Monday, is a difficult day. I have already experienced massive pressure from my fellow deputies. They are demanding that we show in full a sitting of one chamber. They do not have the right to make demands. I will tell them that at a session. Our television company belongs to Russia and Russia's fellow citizens.

Of late we have acquired the easy ability to insult. Our conscience does not prick us. That is inadmissible—both for a journalist and for a Politburo member. It is necessary to understand a simple idea: We are all different. We must not be insulted, discounted, or discarded. We are all in the same boat called the fatherland.

The most important thing here is that our television and radio company is against monopolies. We have no intention of directing local studios—only of cooperating and coordinating.

We will not create monopolies on ideas and opinions. Our motto is freedom of creative activity, which does not preclude but rather presupposes competition. [Poptsov ends]

Well, we hope that Russian Television keeps to this splendid motto and is consistent in its antimonopoly endeavors. It is up to the viewers to pass judgment on the television programs.

### Kravchenko on Joint-Stock Leningrad TV Company

*PM1405085391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 May 91 Union Edition p 1*

[Report from IZVESTIYA, TASS, POSTFAKTUM, SIBINFORM, REUTER, and UPI roundup: "Leningrad TV Will Become Joint-Stock Company"]

[Text] A joint sitting of the Leningrad Soviet and Leningrad Oblast Soviet Presidiums has decided to set up the Leningrad State Television Company on a joint-stock basis. Its founders are the All-Union Television and Radio Company (33 percent of the stock), the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Ministry of Press and Mass Media (10 percent), and the Leningrad Soviet, the Leningrad Oblast Soviet, and the Leningrad Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting collective (54 percent in all).

Leningrad Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Sobchak announced at a news conference that the agreement from Leonid Kravchenko, chairman of the All-Union Television and Radio Company, to this distribution of property was not secured at a stroke. First, Kravchenko pressed for 75, then for 51 percent of the joint-stock property to belong to the All-Union Television and Radio Company, POSTFAKTUM reports.

### Ryzhkov Currently Drawing Up Election Program

*PM1405134391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 May 91 First Edition p 3*

[A. Gamov report: "Victory Day Is a Holy Day"]

[Text] N.I. Ryzhkov was present at the traditional 9 May meeting of front-line soldiers outside the USSR Bolshoy Theater in Moscow. What brought along the politician, who is popular with the people and whom hundreds of labor collectives and public organizations have named as their candidate for the post of president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic?

"Victory Day is a holy day for all Soviet people," Nikolay Ivanovich said at the meeting. "This is why I have come here with my grandson, to greet Great Patriotic War veterans and to join with them in honoring on this day the memory of those who did not return from the battlefield. We all owe a great debt to our victors. Regardless of whether or not I become president, I will do all in my power to strengthen the traditions they won and to ease the life of former frontline soldiers."

N.I. Ryzhkov reported that today he is experiencing a special time in his life. The many letters and telegrams which he is receiving from labor collectives and individual citizens during these May days have enabled him once again to see for himself the correctness of the decision he has made to enter the struggle for the post of president of Russia.

"People are fed up with the muddle and disorder reigning in the republic and the country today," Nikolay Ivanovich remarked. "The people demand calm. I am working right now with my aides on an election program aimed at stabilizing the situation in society, ensuring working people's social protection under conditions of a market economy, and inspiring them with confidence in the future."

### Cited on Campaign Platform

*LD1405130791 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 14 May 91*

[Text] The former Soviet prime minister, Nikolay Ryzhkov, sees his mission in helping to revive great Russia. He has told newsmen he agreed to run for the Presidency of the Russian Federation because he felt the Federation's leaders, including Boris Yeltsin, were playing with fire. Priority must be given to stabilizing the situation and check the economic downfall so as to give the population a glimmer of hope. Nikolay Ryzhkov opposed private ownership of land and the disbandment of collective and state run farms. These, he felt, had not exhausted their potential. If elected president of the Russian Federation, he stressed, he would launch dialogue with all political parties and movements.

### Campaign Leader Comments

*PM1405114591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 May 91 First Edition p 1*

[Interview with V.L. Savakov, leader of the initiative group to conduct N.I. Ryzhkov's election campaign, by A. Gamov; date and place of interview not stated; first two paragraphs are introduction: "Headquarters Has Set to Work"]

[Text] The initiative group to conduct the election campaign of N.I. Ryzhkov who, as is well known, has been named by hundreds of labor collectives and public

organizations as their candidate for the post of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] president has set to work.

We talk with V.L. Savakov, leader of the initiative group.

[Gamov] Vladimir Lukyanovich, why were you the one whom Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov entrusted with heading work to organize his election campaign?

[Savakov] Obviously because for the past six years, since the time when N.I. Ryzhkov was working in the CPSU Central Committee, I have constantly been his assistant.

In addition we have common views, common approaches toward those problems which were resolved at the very start of perestroyka and are now being resolved. I am very impressed by the fact that Nikolay Ivanovich opposes populism, hypocrisy, self-advertising, playing on the mob's base feelings, and any politics mongering. He is against the collapse of our state, in favor of 95 percent of Soviet people, not five percent, being protected both now and in the future by the state against the adversities connected with drastic decline in the living standard. He is also in favor of the nation avoiding impoverishment, in favor of all people in our country being able to live normally, in a human way, as they say, irrespective of nationality, religion, political views, and opinions.

In life, in his relations with people, N.I. Ryzhkov strictly follows principles which can be expressed as follows: Do not lie, do not take, do not betray, do not sell. I value him as a man who firmly defends his principles, who is merciful toward the weak and compassionate toward human grief, as a politician invested with outstanding natural qualities, balanced in his decisions, and with a statesmanlike wisdom in his actions. In brief, I think the way he does.

[Gamov] What is the initiative group you head, what does it do?

[Savakov] As is well known, Nikolay Ivanovich is on pension and in contrast to some other contenders for the post of Russian president he does not have his own permanent staff apparatus of the kind which, let us be frank, his competitors are already using to conduct their election campaigns. Our initiative group is small but sufficiently mobile and works on the basis of public principles. It has been joined by economic experts, political scientists, legal experts, sociologists, and journalists with experience in organizing election campaigns.

We are having to begin a lot from literally nothing. Just take questions like the collection of signatures and agitation for a future candidate locally. If to this end we use the traditional structures our contender will obviously be on unequal terms compared with his rivals. That is why we ourselves have had to establish ties with the oblasts and republics of Russia and with large organizations and enterprises in order to set up work there.

[Gamov] What is the program with which N.I. Ryzhkov intends to come out at the presidential elections?

[Savakov] Actually, the package of questions which Nikolay Ivanovich intends to submit for the voters' judgment has already been elaborated—I have in mind the government program aimed at intensifying economic reform. But considering that quite a lot of time has elapsed since then, that the situation has changed drastically in the country as a whole and in Russia, Nikolay Ivanovich has reached the conviction that a more specific, thorough program for the republic's emergence from the crisis is needed. He is now engaged in forming it in conjunction with his working group.

I should like to note that in his speeches today Nikolay Ivanovich relies on the recommendations not only of theorists in the field of politics and economics, but also on those of practical specialists. We asked a number of leaders of industrial enterprises and collective and state farms, especially in Ryazan Oblast, Bashkiria, and other regions to voice their proposals for the formation of the presidential candidate's election program.

[Gamov] What could you say about the basic measures which will be taken within the framework of the election campaign?

[Savakov] N.I. Ryzhkov's informal meetings with the working people and the public are taking place constantly—at his own home, at various meetings where he is invited, and simply on the street. A schedule of official meetings is now being drawn up. Within the framework of the election campaign there will be trips to a number of Russian cities and N.I. Ryzhkov will also visit several Moscow labor collectives. It is planned that after registration the candidate RSFSR president will also speak on Central Television. It is planned to conduct a number of other measures. In brief, there is a lot of work ahead....

[Gamov] How does the "Ryzhkov team" assess Nikolay Ivanovich's chances in the election struggle?

[Savakov] We are hoping to win.

### Nominated by Over 500 Groups

*LD1405193891 Moscow TASS in English 1915 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS correspondents Nikolay Veretin and Ruben Shirinyan]

[Text] Moscow May 14 TASS—"Over 500 enterprises and organisations have already nominated former prime minister Nikolay Ryzhkov as candidate for the Russian Federation presidency. Nearly 600,000 signatures have been collected in support of his candidature," head of Ryzhkov's election campaign, Vladimir Savakov, told a news conference here today.

Experts believe that Ryzhkov may count on the voices of a considerable number of peasants, the military and

pensioners. According to some forecasts, the former prime minister can be supported by 25 per cent of the electorate.

According to a law recently passed by the Russian Supreme Soviet, a presidential candidate can be nominated by officially registered political parties and mass organisations, trade unions, as well as electors' groups if they collect 100,000 signatures.

Savakov said that Ryzhkov has not decided yet on the candidacy of a vice-president.

Other candidates to the post of Russian Federation president include Russian Parliament head Boris Yeltsin, member of the Security Council Vadim Bakatin and leader of the Workers' United Front Aleksey Sergeyev.

Presidential elections are scheduled for June 12. Registration of candidates continues until May 21. Ryzhkov is expected to register as presidential candidate on May 17, Savakov said.

Until now, the Central Election Commission accepted only one application, from leader of the Liberal-Democratic Party, 45-years-old Vladimir Zhirinovskiy.

## RSFSR Electoral Commission Chairman Cited

*PM1505092791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian*
*15 May 91 Second Edition p 1*

[Report by Ye. Sorokin: "Election Marathon"]

[Text] Despite the fact that less than a month remains until the election of the Russian president, those anxious to assume the republic's supreme state post are so far not crowding the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Central Electoral Commission.

V. Kazakov, chairman of the Central Electoral Commission, reported yesterday that as of 14 May only one person—V. Zhirinovskiy, leader of the Liberal Democratic Party—had officially applied for the president's chair. As of yesterday there had been no such applications from V. Bakatin, B. Yeltsin, or N. Ryzhkov.

"Although," V. Kazakov continued, "I know that initiative groups to nominate presidential candidates have been working quite actively and I think that our forecasts will soon come true. I mean that there will be at least 10 official applications. I want to stress immediately that in its work the Central Electoral Commission is guided exclusively by the law and does not take account of the political allegiance and social orientation of contenders or of the posts they now hold.

"In particular we have had to explain to some contenders the provisions of the law on the election of the RSFSR president. Thus, V. Voronin submitted a claim from the organization of Meskhetian Turks and the bloc of centrist parties, but it was not registered. After all, nomination either from a public organization or from one of the parties officially registered at republican or Union level is legal. There was an application from a party registered only by the Moscow City Soviet, which also does not come within the law's operation. Recently the Russian people's academy of sciences nominated I. Klochkov, chairman of the Federation of RSFSR Independent Trade Unions, as a presidential candidate.

"Our main work," V. Kazakov continued, "is now focused on organizing the activity of the precinct electoral commissions. Many questions are arising there for which we are having to take prompt decisions."

A session of the Central Electoral Commission will be held 16 May and will sum up the first results of the election campaign.

Yesterday evening the leaders of the initiative group to nominate N. Ryzhkov as presidential candidate held a briefing. It was announced that about 600,000 voters' votes had already been collected in support of the ex-premier's candidacy. N. Ryzhkov's rating is quite high and he will obviously offer serious competition to his opponents.

## Presidency Candidates Tardy in Registering

*PM1405173591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian*
*15 May 91 First Edition p 1*

["From Official Sources" article by V. Andreyev: "Russian Presidential Campaign Has Not Started Yet"]

[Text] The rumors in Moscow about the start of the official campaign for the post of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] president have proved to be somewhat exaggerated.

As V. Timonin, chief of the Central Electoral Committee for the Russian Presidential Elections Secretariat, informed us, as of yesterday the commission had not registered a single candidate, including the nominees of labor collectives and organizations: B. Yeltsin, N. Ryzhkov, V. Bakatin, B. Gromov, and a number of other politicians.

"We are waiting for the final official registration of the candidates, which will evidently happen in the 20-29 May period," V. Timonin said. "What is the reason for this? The documents registering candidates for the post of Russian president are not ready. We have already repeatedly requested the necessary forms from B. Yeltsin, N. Ryzhkov, and others...."

You get the impression that in a country famed for its bureaucratic tradition even teams of professional office-seekers have not been able to apply their many years of experience to filling in official forms. Or are they just relying on the Russian tradition of leaving everything until the last minute?

## RSFSR Presidential Hopefuls Detailed

*PM1405132191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 May 91 p 4*

[Unattributed feature incorporating reports by I. Potekhina and D. Solonnikov, V. Pomytkin, R. Farzutdinov, and Yu. Uzdemir: "All the Contenders Prepare for Battle"]

[Text] The list of B. Yeltsin's rivals in the battle for the post of RSFSR president is lengthening not daily but hourly. The deadline for handing in registration applications expires 21 May. So far the Russian Central Electoral Commission has received only V. Zhirinovskiy's application. The rest are gathering strength and signatures....

### Abolitionist Candidate

For people who have closely followed the turbulent academic activity of Moscow Professor A. Sergeyev, his appearance in the ranks of the United Front of Working People came as no surprise. The slogan proclaimed by Aleksey Alekseyevich—"There is an alternative to the market"—was bound to make an impression on the leaders of the United Front of Working People. The respected doctor of economic sciences was swiftly proclaimed the new ideologist of our time.

So when at the Second Initiative Congress of the Russian Communist Party [as published] it was announced that "The United Front of Working People has put forward Prof. Aleksey Alekseyevich Sergeyev as candidate for president of Russia, and we have a proposal to support his candidacy!" the hall erupted in tumultuous applause. Following the ancient party tradition, the elections did not offer a choice between candidates, of course.

Instructions were immediately issued to the new candidate:

"Seek and obtain the post of president. And once you have obtained it, abolish it and restore Soviet power! Who is 'in favor'?"

Tumultuous applause, developing into an ovation.

What alternative to the market did the learned economist propose in his speech in reply? An exceptionally scientific one.

"...We have already collected even more signatures than necessary to convene an extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies. At the congress we must demand the introduction of a state of emergency."

Then the economy can be developed according to the well known 1937 scenario. First Gorbachev can be given his due for "violating the mandate of trust from the 28th congress and opening the doors to private enterprise." Then there can be a "public trial of the group of learned economists who are to blame for the country's collapse." (It is scarcely worth listing their names.) And then the "question of the other traitors and opportunists" can be decided.

### Zhirinovskiy Conquers Europe?

"The main thing is that people have been given the opportunity to choose," Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, the Liberal Democratic Party candidate, says. Russia's inhabitants can elect their president 12 June: Ryzhkov, Yeltsin, or me, for instance. If they don't elect me, they will have nobody but themselves to blame. Let them consider what they have got. If you choose Yeltsin, you get civil war. If you choose Ryzhkov, you get a new model of stagnation. You made the choice. But if you want to live in a European state, choose Zhirinovskiy. And I am sure that several million people will vote for me."

[Pomytkin] Is your confidence based on any sociological surveys?

[Zhirinovskiy] It is simply my understanding of the situation, and I travel the country and talk to people.... Incidentally, a car rally visiting many European countries has now begun, Soviet sociologists are taking part in it, and they are carrying our party's advertisements....

### If You Don't Like the Reds, Pick a "Gay"

Activists of the Sexual Minorities Association have managed to collect the first 10,000 signatures in support of Roman Kalinin, their candidate for president of Russia. In conversation with your correspondent, the candidate himself expressed the confidence that at least 40 percent of Russia's voters will vote for him. Ten percent are homosexuals and lesbians, and another 30 percent are people "tired of politics and verbal masturbation."

The program of the "minorities' candidate" is simple and radical: increasing working people's wages and reducing vodka prices by dissolving the army and the KGB and "selling Russia off to foreign monopolies:"

"I don't care what language the manager speaks. It's better to be rich and healthy under a German than poor and sick under some guzzling Russian."

R. Kalinin does not have a very high opinion of his rivals in the election campaign: Bakatin is a "dark horse," Zhirinovskiy is a "KGB agent," Ryzhkov is "someone who is even more of a joke than I am," and Yeltsin is a "man who has been a Communist all his life and remains one."

"I don't want to seem a fantasist," R. Kalinin declared. "About 15 years ago Harvey Milk—an open 'gay'—was elected mayor of San Francisco. But he was killed on the threshold of city hall. Because people are prepared to forgive other people anything you like, except being different in their thinking and sleeping arrangements."

Yesterday, so we were told by M. Ogorodnikov, a staffer of the newspaper TEMA ["Theme," published by the Sexual Minorities Association], Roman Kalinin was

robbed near his home. The car in which Roman was returning home was stopped by persons unknown. He was brutally beaten. Kalinin is now hospitalized with severe head injuries and numerous internal injuries.

**Who Has Ligachev's Backing?**

All the indications are that the election campaign is under way in the coal mining regions of the country. Yeltsin is scoring points in the Kuzbass. In Novokuznetsk he signed the decision on transferring mines to Russia's jurisdiction, thereby meeting one of the demands of the strike committees.

His opponents are also currying favor among the miners. During his visit to Donetsk Ye. Ligachev called on the miners to support the country's former premier in the elections. "You will not be taking part in the voting, but you will be able to support N.I. Ryzhkov."

Assessing the contenders' chances, Ye. Ligachev opted for the ex-premier. "Nikolay Ivanovich, a real citizen and Communist, did not succeed in everything, many mistakes are attributed to the government he headed, but he did not have the conditions to properly show his mettle," Yegor Kuzmich lamented. In his view, Ryzhkov's candidacy for the post of president of Russia is preferable to that of the Russian Communists' leader. It is better for Polozkov to concentrate on leading the Russian Communist Party.

Russian Communists are intended to give powerful support to Nikolay Ivanovich. At a Central Committee plenum N. Ryzhkov has been proclaimed the official candidate for Russian president from the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party.

**Bakatin Still in the Shadows**

As we have already reported, a number of Kirov Oblast and Petrozavodsk labor collectives have nominated V. Bakatin, the former minister of internal affairs and now member of the country's Security Council, as candidate for Russian president.

Vadim Viktorovich himself is not as yet taking part in the election campaign, explaining this by his reluctance to be a "self-nominator" like certain other candidates. However, he is not refusing to take part in the elections—provided that the necessary 100,000 signatures are collected and he is officially registered at the Central Electoral Commission. In the meantime Bakatin is refraining from public speeches and interviews.

**Meanwhile....**

According to various news agencies, the following have also been put forward as candidates for the post of RSFSR president:

Aman Tuleyev, chairman of Kemerovo Oblast Soviet and Oblast Soviet Executive Committee;

Arkadiy Bugayev, cochairman of the Russian Democratic Forum;

Aleksandr Nevzorov, television commentator and moderator of the Leningrad TV program "600 Seconds";

Lev Ubozhko, chairman of the Conservative Party;

Albert Makashov, colonel general and commander of the Volga-Urals Military District;

Vyacheslav Potemkin, chairman of the Progressive Party;

Vladimir Voronin, chairman of the Centrist Bloc of Political Parties and Movements;

Svetlana Goryacheva, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet;

Boris Gromov, colonel general and USSR deputy minister of internal affairs;

Vasiliy Besedin, chairman of the Stavropol Kray Farmers Association.

## RSFSR Communist Party Holds Plenary Meeting

### Yields Few Practical Results

*LD1405155191 Moscow TASS in English 1532 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS world service analyst Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow May 14 TASS—The only practical result of the plenary meeting of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee on Monday was the expression of support by Russian communists for former Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov who is now running for the post of Russian president.

The discussion of the other item on the agenda—on tasks for party organisations in taking measures of social protection of the population under the conditions of implementing anti-crisis programmes—yielded no constructive results, although, according to observers, it had been intended as central.

The discussion at the plenary meeting revealed that the Russian Communist Party has nothing radical to propose in the social and economic field. Apart from usual anti-market invectives by representatives of the party's most orthodox wing, which is categorically opposed to the "capitalization of the economy", there were calls to return to the alternative programme for taking Russia out of the crisis, which was submitted to the Third Congress of Russian People's Deputies on behalf of the Communists of Russia group. The congress declined that programme drafted by Yuriy Voronin as aiming at the restoration of the command-and-pressure methods in the economy.

On the role of the Communist Party in society, many speakers had to admit that the Russian Communist

Party often found itself bringing up the rear of the political struggle. "The party and striking workers found themselves on the opposite sides of the barricades," Ivan Boltovskiy said. Central Committee member Natalia Remneva pointed out that the party was losing control over the youth and women's movements.

The plenary meeting also focused on the unity of the Russian Communist Party. The problem arose following the creation by Central Committee member Aleksandr Rutskiy of a new faction, Communists for Democracy, in the Russian parliament in addition to the already existing Communists of Russia faction. Speakers at the plenary meeting blasted Rutskiy for "cracking up the party".

Many speakers at the plenum voiced support for the ideas put forth in Central Committee secretary Gennadiy Zyuganov's open letter to Aleksandr Yakovlev, which was published in the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA newspaper on May 7. The letter was sharply critical of the activity of Yakovlev, a senior aide to the Soviet president. According to Russian Communist Party leder Ivan Polozkov, attempts are being made to achieve the disintegration of the party from within and "dig a trench between the leaders of the Soviet Communist Party and the Russian Communist Party". These attempts, Polozkov said, are being made at the top level.

The leaders and members of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee shunned self-criticism in their speeches. They had nothing to say either about the situation inside the party or its increasingly frequent failures to come up with political initiatives. A different tendency prevailed—attempts were being made to find somebody to blame not only among "destructive forces" but also among the Soviet Communist Party's top leadership.

### Melnikov, Sokolov Deliver Reports

*PM1405110591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 May 91 First Edition p 1*

[Unattributed "Information Report" "On RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee Plenum opened yesterday. Members of the Communist Party's Central Control Commission, first secretaries of party committees, representatives of the control commissions of republican, kray, oblast, and okrug party organizations, USSR and RSFSR people's deputies, and rectors of party educational establishments who do not belong to the Communist Party's central elected organs were invited to it.

On the agenda were:

1. The party organizations' tasks in implementing measures for the population's social protection under the conditions of the implementation of anticrisis programs.
2. Participation in the election of the RSFSR president.
3. Organizational questions.
4. Any other business.

RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Secretaries A.G. Melnikov and A.S. Sokolov delivered reports on the first two questions.

### Communist Party Office in Kaliningrad Bombed

*PM1405152791 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 May 91 p 2*

[SEVERO-ZAPAD report: "Bomb in Rayon (as published) Party Committee"]

[Text] The first attack on Communist Party property has been made in Kaliningrad Oblast. A criminal threw a home-made incendiary device into the lobby of the Gusev Russian Communist Party Gorkom [City Committee] building.

Fortunately, the time chosen for the act of terrorism was at night, and so nobody was hurt. The material damage proved insignificant—there was nothing in the lobby to burn. The criminal fled, and the militia is looking for him. A gorkom employee, who hurried to answer the urgent callout, stated: "Shells are falling closer and closer...."

### Communist Party Secretary Assails Yakovlev

*PM0805082591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 7 May 91 Second Edition p 2*

["Open Letter to A.N. Yakovlev" by G. Zyuganov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee: "Architect Amid the Ruins. Open Letter to A.N. Yakovlev About His Recent Statements and Other Matters"]

[Text] Aleksandr Nikolayevich!

In a long interview with Germany's DER STERN magazine recently right at the outset you pointed your influential finger, as senior adviser to the country's president, straight at perestroyka's chief opponent: "They are very dangerous, the Russian Communist Party apparatus, for instance. Its leadership is dengerous as well. They are openly saying that perestroyka has deviated from its course...."

We will not work out here who "they" are. Your sharply negative attitude toward the very idea of creating the Russian Communist Party is no news to the general reader. Your suspicions emerged even before the founding congress, and here you were clearly relying on the arguments of figures such as Stalin and Trotskiy. One way or another, the question of forming the Russian organization has been resolved. Today you are already making accusations against it. Is it not the bureaucrats and conservatives, as you have furiously been trying to persuade us throughout these years, nor even the administrative-edict system—that progeny [ischadiye] of all

evils—but the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee apparatus, which numbers just 150 or so people and has been in existence for only a matter of months, which is threatening to halt the march of revolutionary perestroyka?

The charge is so grave and unjust that I, as a Central Committee secretary, see it as my duty to address an open letter to you and to speak out extremely frankly. Especially as I have worked in the selfsame CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department where you were molded for many years as a leading party ideologist. I am very familiar with not only your principles and your thinking, but also your style of leadership and attitude toward your comrades.

It must first be explained that we have different impressions of what is going on. Whereas you continue to reiterate that everything is fine, perestroyka is heading in the right direction, and this is bringing satisfaction and happiness, I assess the situation in a totally different way. It seems to me that our ship of state is drifting rudderless and without sails in the raging political sea and is about to hit the rocks.

As I see it, perestroyka is primarily creation relying on science, common sense, the people's traditions, our own experience, and international experience. Unfortunately, however, there is no sign of creation. At the moment, everything that is happening is like a Europeanized version of the notorious Chinese "cultural revolution" with an adventurist desire to repeat the "great leap forward" in just 500 days.

The country is suffering strife, ruin, disintegration, and demoralization. Confrontation and irresponsibility have become the basis of existence. Just take a look at the capital, Aleksandr Nikolayevich, let alone the "trouble spots," which you avoid visiting. Under the nose of leaders of every stripe and hue, it has been transformed into an all-union political dump, a breeding ground for all that is unhealthy and immoral. Can the people believe, when they look at all this bedlam, that perestroyka is developing in the correct direction? I think not. You always taught me and other staffers that you must proceed from life, from practice, and take the mood of the masses into account. That mood, you will agree, is dreadful. Nothing but discontent and aggressiveness. When people are in such a state is it possible to hope that very complex reforms will succeed? That is to disregard the basics of political science.

What we are seeing today is called a national disaster comparable with the civil war or the invasion by Hitlerite fascism. But even fascism did not succeed in setting at loggerheads peoples and generations, fathers and children, city people and people in the countryside, yet today this is a bitter and tragic fact of our reality. This danger, strange though it may seem, does not bother you. On the contrary, you see yourself as a "happy man" and a participant in "the great renewal of a great country and its historic march into the world of freedom."

I do not hear you expressing alarm at the fact that the main declarations of perestroyka are swiftly degenerating into their opposite.

It is now clear to everyone that democracy has been supplanted by a war of laws, sovereignties, and powers, by the raging passions of the mob, and by the disintegration of the state. As in the distant past, an alliance of extreme reactionaries [okhotnoryadtsy], the lumpenized intelligentsia, and criminals is emerging. The entire system of civil education has been destroyed, as though the teachers of renewal had decided to raise future proponents of perestroyka out of hard currency hookers and pimps.

Glasnost has long since descended into hysterical shouting and has become a weapon in psychological warfare against the people. Cunning people are adapting it as a marketable commodity in the emerging market relations. Everyone who was alongside you could see that you made, so to speak, an invaluable contribution to this process. The series of political portraits about the "good man in the Politburo" couched in the classic eulogistic style is graphic confirmation of that.

You constantly assured us that we are becoming civilized and are building a rule-of-law state, but in reality this has amounted to universal deprivation of rights, a split in society, a parade of obscenities, and total loss of state dignity. Is it not astonishing that an emissary, even if he is from a great foreign power, when he arrives in the Union should with imperious bluntness summon the leaders of the republics. That was the kind of treatment given only to the chiefs of half-savage tribes, and then only after they had been plied with plenty of strong drink from across the ocean. It looks as though this too in no way angers you, as the president's adviser.

You perceived as the main threat to perestroyka the intrigues of the apparatus of the party of Russian Communists, which, I repeat, has been in existence for just a few months. You are simply flattering us. We still cannot cope with our direct primary duties. There is a great deal that we are not managing to do, and we are rightly criticized for this by party organizations and labor collectives.

We are not even able to prove to the president and to you that it is impossible to run a country like ours merely by verbiage, no matter how masterly. That complex social systems can be modernized only bit by bit, and certainly not wholesale. You cannot destroy the structures of executive power when you have nothing to take their place. It is socially disastrous to forcibly break the link between ages and overturn generally accepted ideological values. Given your knowledge of Soviet and foreign sources, this lightweight attitude toward the basic demands of dialectics—continuity and innovation—is astonishing.

You constantly go into raptures over the successes of democratization. It is obvious to everyone, however, that a disastrous triarchy in the shape of the center, the Russian leadership, and national-separatism is emerging against the backdrop of the protracted paralysis of power in the country. Sovereign legislators, ignoring human rights and the USSR Constitution, are "pumping up" their own rights and intending to organize life according to their own laws. It is hard to imagine a greater absurdity—a legislator playing the role of constant violator of the laws. In this respect we certainly "lead the world"...

What lies in store for us—the final destruction of all social links, which will inevitably bring a nuclear power to social explosion? Or the shortest path toward a dictatorship, whether right-wing, left-wing, "brown," or "yellow"—what is the difference? The "architects of perestroyka" who readily allow the possibility of such a development of events are assuming an extremely grave responsibility before history and their compatriots. Do you see as dangerous those who would like to prevent a tragedy for the people?

It is right to deny you both political and civil trust. This question arose back at the 28th CPSU Congress and was trenchantly raised at recent party plenums. Personally I have long ceased to feel such trust in you. I have made no secret of this and I make no secret of it. My attitude is based not on emotions, not on the present plight, but on your practical activity, including activity concealed from broad public opinion. This activity is based on subjective idealism and political snobbishness, mixed up with the very thirst for honors and power that you are outwardly so vocal in condemning.

I admit that, like many people, at first I was won over by your liberalism, your relaxed opinions, and the pointedness of your assessments, although now I can see that this was like the hour of glory of Foma Opiskin from the village of Stepanchikovo [attitudinizing petty tyrant in Dostoyevskiy story]. Then the relaxed approach came to smack of cold nonchalance and the wit was astonishing in its cynicism. One day, I remember, you nonchalantly tapped a fat file and said it was the plan for perestroyka, and we would turn this country upside down without fail. The phrase grated on me: Why "this" country and not "our" country, and what was the point of turning a wretched country "upside down"? After all, the country contains not only people but also missiles, Comrades!.. Alas, this proved to be more than bragging: They did not merely turn it "upside down," but very nearly inside out!

I do not know whether you are capable of making a self-critical assessment of your deeds and their results. I think not. Because you have skipped from one eminence to another—six top posts in the last six years—you have not once accounted for your work. Even at the last party congress, when every Politburo member had to report back to the party, you got angry and pretended you did not understand what was required of you.

Judging by the numerous compliments from your interviewers, you like it when you are described as the "architect of perestroyka." The compliments are more than dubious—after all, the architect is amid ruins... You can scarcely console yourself with the ranks, prizes, and titles that have suddenly rained down.

I know why you have now begun to speak out so vigorously. The moment of mass awakening is dawning. We are speaking increasingly often and increasingly loudly of the deep-seated reasons for the degeneration of perestroyka and, of course, we want to be sure of the conscientiousness of its designers. You realize perfectly well that ultimately someone is going to have to bear personal responsibility for all this chaos, so you are trying to deflect the arrows of the people's anger and are calmly pointing the finger now in one direction, now in another. Now "they," the Russian Communists, are "very dangerous." You declare them to be a dangerous force at the moment when the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee is mustering everyone to avert a disaster for the whole people and is persistently seeking mutual understanding with its political opponents, and when real paths of consensus have emerged on the basis of the statement by the leaders of the center and the nine republics. You have a rare ability to add fuel to the flames at what is for you the right moment...

Yes, perestroyka, in its present form and conditions, owes a great deal to your talent and energy. You began your post-April activity as leader of a top Central Committee department, you were responsible for ideological support for perestroyka, and since then, no matter how your official career has shaped up, you have kept a vigilant eye on this sphere. It is precisely under your leadership that the new ideological stereotypes whereby we were all supposed to "acquire the new thinking" and fall prey to illusions were invented, polished, and "put into action." For all the diversity of the newly introduced stereotypes, they shared an abstract quality, a deliberate ambiguity, and an indulgence in shrill name-calling! These stereotypes naturally very soon became the camouflage and justification for the most unsavory practical, theoretical, and moral arbitrariness.

"Stagnation"!—use this as a term of abuse and you need answer for nothing in the recent past, you need not go into the contradictions characteristic of any time, you need not explain who wrecked the country, how, and where and who dragged it out of the quagmire.

The "administrative-command system"!—use that label and without a second thought you can destroy any of the life-support systems of the country and the state without worrying in the least what is to replace what has been destroyed.

The "return to world civilization"!—proclaim that slogan and you can hack away at the unique living organism—formed over not only decades but centuries—of Soviet, Russian society and statehood and graft

onto it any management, political, or cultural surrogate picked up at a Western flea market...

Among these means of "ideological support for perestroyka" there are two "outstanding" ones whose influence will long mark society. They have the most immediate relevance to your tireless activity, Aleksandr Nikolayevich.

The first thesis proclaims that the "mass media merely reflect reality, they do not shape it." Since that is so, then the fundamental distinction between truth and lies is effectively erased. So you can now mix them in any required proportions on newspaper pages or over the airwaves, gradually increasing the dose of poisonous disinformation, by degrees poisoning the minds of readers, viewers, and listeners, and training them without batting an eyelid to swallow and accept as the norm unpardonable historical lies, esthetic vulgarity, and moral ugliness. The main thing is to deprive people of the ability to distinguish truth, good, and beauty from lies, evil, and ugliness. Here too we have clearly been successful.

You will naturally object indignantly, Aleksandr Nikolayevich: Such talk is a crude distortion of the ideals of glasnost and freedom of speech, something totally different was intended. Not true! This is exactly what was intended, as testified by your directive speeches and statements, which are full of ambiguities, innuendoes, and heavy hints.

You feel concern for the lofty ideals of glasnost exclusively in cases where it concerns yourself. When the pirates of glasnost need to mount a personal campaign, however, the "ideals" are no impediment. For months you maintained an olympian calm while the section of the press that is obedient to you hounded Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov—your party and leadership comrade, incidentally—while "yellow" publications and politicos slung mud at the president, and when a frenzied pandemonium erupted over V.S. Pavlov or A.I. Lukyanov. What became of your "tolerance" when leaflets containing a summary of your conversation with young delegates were passed from hand to hand at the party congress? Why was such a fuss kicked up; why was the entire "democratic" press mobilized; why was a commission promptly set up to seek the culprits and investigate the anti-Yakovlev activity? Would you not wait for life to put everything in its place and the people to learn the truth? Of course, truth must be defended "here and now," not left to the verdict of our descendants. But for some reason you are guided by this principle only when your personal interests are concerned?..

Your second favorite thesis proclaims: "Everything that is not prohibited by law is permitted." We are not going to mention the clear moral untenability of this thesis. I invite you once again to ponder how disastrous this thesis is for a country where entire areas of civil and criminal legislation have not been elaborated and where there is no age-old tradition of obedience to the law. Very bad, you will say. Yes, but such is reality. How can we not reckon with it? How can you, of all people, who have presented Western readers with a new book with the significant title "Realism Is the Land of Perestroyka," not reckon with it?

You told DER STERN's correspondent: "You can calmly sell everything except your conscience to remove inflationary money from the population. Even tanks, but no one is buying them." I do not know what the market price of a conscience is—there are sellers even among those who have nothing to sell—but tanks, armored personnel carriers, mortars, and assault rifles are in great demand. Never mind the "trouble spots," there is shooting every night and sometimes during the day even in Moscow. I would remind you for purposes of comparison that five years ago combat firearms were used 15 times in Moscow over the course of the year, and the prosecutor's office initiated a separate case about each such fact.

I would also remind you that in the year when you were responsible for the fight against crime in the Presidential Council, the number of people who were killed or who died as a result of accidents increased by 45,000, and the number of victims of other serious crimes increased by 109,000. Three times as many as in the iniquitous 10-year Afghan war! As far as I am aware, you have never made any comment on these terrible figures. Just as you avoid speaking of the human rights violations in a number of republics and regions and of the existence of hundreds of thousands of refugees in the country. Yet you were perfectly well informed in advance of the possibility of a tragic development of events. You were sent several dozen information and analysis notes about the situation in Lithuania alone. So why does your "restless conscience" remain silent?

Finally, a few words about one last stereotype that you have not managed to introduce. I refer to the failed attempt by your supporters to destroy the image of Vladimir Ilich Lenin and his ideological legacy in people's minds. You yourself have been forced to admit this defeat. It is not even a year since you publicly swore your attitude toward Lenin was "super-good." Now.... Let the reader learn of this from your own interview with the Paris newspaper LA TRIBUNE DE L'EXPANSION and assess the full depth of your principles.

"Question: There is a photograph of Gorbachev on your desk. There is an official portrait of him on the wall. But what about Lenin? Do you have no portrait of Lenin?

"Answer: (Smiling) There are three nails opposite.

"Question: With nothing hanging on them. Did there use to be a portrait of Lenin there?

"Answer: It was scarcely a portrait of Roosevelt."

Notifying the whole of Europe, you have ostentatiously thrown out a portrait of Lenin and have thereby issued to yourself a certificate of poverty. Are you hoping to

inspire somebody by your personal example? There are, of course, many people who are deafened by the hammering of your ideological threshing machine. A sobering-up will inevitably come.

Then you will have to look back and sum up what you have achieved. Do not say that you and your comrades "awakened the people" and "opened their eyes." People whose eyes are open do not kill each other merely for belonging to different nationalities, do not destroy with their own hands, to suit the internecine conflicts of irresponsible politicos, the industrial potential of the country in which their children and grandchildren will have to live, do not hound their own army, do not humiliate the gray hairs of old people, do not destroy historical and cultural monuments...

Do not lull yourself and your comrades in the party of which you have been a member for almost all your adult life with the invisible but supposedly real successes of perestroyka. In those recent days when the president admitted in the Federation Council that the country's situation is catastrophic, when more blast furnaces were idle than in 1942, and when gunmen were firing salvoes of rockets in the Transcaucasus, you were being feted in Britain as an honorary doctor of sciences. Clearly for your successes in perestroyka. Has there not been enough playacting?..

I am perfectly well aware that I have not gladdened my comrades with this frank clearing of the air with the "architect of perestroyka" amid its emerging ruins. I want to ardently call on Communists whose heart bleeds for our long-suffering homeland not to hurry to quit the party, despite all the difficulties and strife. Wherever people have hastily thrown in their party cards, poison shoots which are suffocating the working people have already emerged. Take a closer look at the sociopolitical picture in Lithuania, Georgia, Armenia, and Eastern Europe. There are masses of red flags at the May Day celebrations and banners are appearing: "Communists, forgive us, you were right!" The promised universal affluence will scarcely happen there this century. Common human values cannot survive without social justice and concern about those who earn their livelihood by their labor. We took on this concern when, honestly and sincerely and not for the sake of playacting and a career, we joined the Communists' ranks.

## Russian Militia's Departyization Protested

*PM1405105391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 May 91 First Edition p 1*

[Statement signed by RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo; date not given: "Statement by the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo"]

[Text] Having assessed the present socioeconomic and political situation, the Third Extraordinary Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies granted the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, its leadership, and the republic government additional powers to extricate Russia from the crisis.

At the same time the Congress resolutely rejected attempts to increase confrontation in society, to implement measures of a political or, rather, an anticommunist nature, and to carry out the departyization of the Army, of law-enforcement and other state organizations, establishments, and educational institutions. The Congress urged all political forces to cooperate.

It is a bewildering fact that the will of the Congress was ignored, and the first step in implementing the decision to redistribute powers in the highest echelon of power in the RSFSR was not to seek ways out of the republic's profound socioeconomic crisis but to increase political confrontation.

On 18 April the RSFSR Supreme Soviet adopted the Law on the Militia, which prohibits the activity of Communists' primary organizations in internal affairs organs subordinate to the RSFSR Ministry of Internal Affairs. This article of the law, which runs counter to the USSR Constitution, was adopted in an atmosphere of unprecedented pressure on deputies. Once again the votes of absent deputies were the determining factor in resolving an acute political question.

Unfortunately, this development of events confirms the warnings of Communist deputies and certain other groups of deputies at the Congress. Emergency powers are beginning to be used not for constructive work in the interests of Russia's peoples but for political struggle.

Actions of this sort, as can already be observed in some parts of the country, are becoming the first step toward the introduction of bans on professions and other discriminatory measures against Communists and violate the rights of public associations and citizens. Members of Russia's other political parties must also be aware of the danger of this course and its fundamental unacceptability.

The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo resolutely protests at attempts to elevate anticommunism to the rank of official republic policy and to debar Communists from vigorous creative activity. Regarding the legitimacy of the RSFSR Law on the Militia in this sphere, we deem it necessary to ask USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman A.I. Lukyanov to send this law to the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee for a conclusion.

The Politburo supports party organizations and all Communist workers in republic internal affairs organs operating in strict accordance with the constitutions of the country and the RSFSR and the CPSU Statutes, and expresses confidence in their high degree of organization, their endurance, and their loyalty to the oath sworn to the people.

[Signed] The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo.

### Isayev Airs Views on Land Reform Difficulties

*LD1405184891 Moscow TASS in English 1841 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS legislative correspondents Boris Zverev and Yuriy Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow May 14 TASS—Land reform in Russia is proceeding with difficulty, Russian Vice-President Boris Isayev told a conference in Moscow today.

He was addressing reform coordinators from among Russia people's deputies responsible for implementing the reform in localities.

"The process is lengthy and complicated and it meets with resistance," Isayev told TASS. "In some places there are cases of sabotage, unequal conditions are being created for individual farmers and collective farms".

The present conference was convened in order to impart an additional impulse to the reform, he noted. Isayev told TASS that resistance notwithstanding, reform is proceeding much more lively this year. More than 900,000 hectares of land was allotted to farmers, numbering more than 20,000. According to his estimates, Russia will have about 100,000 farmers by the end of this year. Along with this, he voiced dissatisfaction with the rate of progress and said this was mainly a result of the crisis of power in Russia.

Russian vice-president believes that resistance to land reform can be overcome if people's deputies of all levels join in.

Isayev said that the Russian Parliament was due to hear reports on the results of the first inspection of the reform process. He said reports of this kind would be called for on a regular basis.

### Acting Russian KGB Chief Interviewed

*PM1305141391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 May 91 Union Edition p 2*

[Interview with Major General Viktor Ivanenko, acting RSFSR KGB chairman, by IZVESTIYA correspondent N. Burbyga; date and place not specified; first paragraph is introduction: "What the Russian KGB Will Do"]

[Text] Our newspaper has already reported that Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, and Vladimir Kryuchkov, chairman of the USSR KGB, have signed a protocol on setting up an RSFSR KGB in accordance with a decision adopted by the Congress of Russian People's Deputies. Major General Viktor Ivanenko, acting chairman of the RSFSR KGB, spoke to our correspondent.

[Burbyga] To begin with, could you say a few words about yourself....

[Ivanenko] I was born in Tyumen Oblast in 1947. I went to school and then to Tyumen Industrial Institute, from which I graduated in 1970. That year I was offered a job at the USSR KGB Tyumen Oblast Directorate, where I worked my way up from officer to directorate chief. In 1986 I was taken onto the USSR KGB Inspectors' Directorate as senior inspector. Until recently I held the post of deputy chief of the USSR KGB Inspectors' Directorate. I am married with three daughters....

[Burbyga] The protocol on the formation of the Russian KGB envisages retaining a unified system for ensuring the country's state security and at the same time separating the powers of the USSR and RSFSR KGB. What does this mean?

[Ivanenko] There is no clear demarcation between these two organizations: There is interpenetration. In the most general terms one can say the following: The USSR KGB prevails as regards rebuffing external threats, while the Russian KGB prevails as far as domestic questions are concerned. The fight against terrorism, outbursts of violence, organized crime, corruption. So the Russian KGB's autonomy will be observed. But the question of separation of powers will be resolved once and for all only after the Union treaty is signed.

[Burbyga] Will all Union KGB structures be transformed into republic structures, or will new links emerge? If so, how will they differ from those at central level?

[Ivanenko] This question is currently under discussion and it is too early to say anything specific. But I have my own ideas which I intend to uphold.

[Burbyga] Will the Russian KGB be a nonparty organization? If so, how can this be squared with the activity of the USSR KGB, whose leadership holds different views....

[Ivanenko] Regrettably, I cannot answer that question: It comes within the competence of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

[Burbyga] What does the future hold for KGB staffers who have fallen into disgrace with the USSR KGB leadership? I am referring primarily to the Sverdlovsk security officers....

[Ivanenko] A word about the Sverdlovsk security officers. The overwhelming majority of them are still working in their organs—as far as I am aware, only two have been dismissed. Not for making their viewpoint public in the press, but for other reasons.

To answer this question in more general terms, I reckon that we need different opinions. To a certain limit: "At the discussion stage," as it were.... Once a decision has been adopted, it must be executed.

By and large, I must say that the problem of democratizing the life of intelligence collectives is waiting to be resolved. I see this concept as follows: A KGB staffer must boldly voice his opinions in the interests of

improving matters, without being afraid of falling out of favor with the bosses. People's opinion must, in particular, be heeded when appointing leaders of various ranks.

KGB organs' staffers are in a difficult position today. Many of them feel concerned about their future. I see my task as being to relieve the existing strain as far as possible from the very outset. Let me explain: Society, the Russian Government, and the state need our work. The KGB today is one of few structures in the state untouched by corruption. The task is to ensure that security officers are given specific targets and that conditions are created for more effective work. In order to achieve this it is primarily necessary to resolve questions of providing legal and social protection for our personnel.

[Burbyga] Is it planned to formulate a law on the RSFSR KGB in the near future?

[Ivanenko] A law on state security organs in the USSR will be considered at a second reading in a few days. This law may, in my view, be seen as the start of the development of a legal base for the activity of state security organs belonging to members of the federation.

As far as I am aware, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet plans to prepare a package of laws for the creation of its own security system. Primarily a law on an RSFSR Security Council attached to the Russian Government which will coordinate the activity of all ministries and departments in this sphere. Work on a draft law on RSFSR security is also in full swing. There are a few alternative RSFSR laws on operational and investigation activity. Work is in prospect on a law on state secrets and on an expert law which will clarify a question of importance to everyone—what can be considered contraband....

[Burbyga] How do you regard secret methods of work? I am referring to telephone tapping and opening of mail.... After all, the KGB should not do this under existing law. What is your view of this problem?

[Ivanenko] I understand people's concern. Unfortunately, our country has no mechanism to protect citizens against outside interference in their personal lives. I am sure that the draft law on security organs in the USSR has enshrined and should retain this norm. The law on operational and investigation activity will consider these questions in greater detail.

### RSFSR Law on State Taxation Service

*914106494*

For this law published in the 18 April 1991 SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-020, dated 25 April 1991, pages 12-15.

## Western Republics

### Moldovan Supreme Soviet Begins Work 14 May

*LD1405154191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1000 GMT 14 May 91*

[Text] The session of the Moldovan Supreme Soviet began work today. Deputies were presented with the report by Moldovan President Snegur, on the state of affairs in economic and political spheres and ways for overcoming the crisis. A whole package of important legislative acts will also be examined; among them are the draft laws on citizenship, privatization, the referendum, the principles of local self-government, on the republican bank and banking activity.

### Proposal on Moldova's Secession Fails

*LD1405183191 Moscow TASS in English 1800 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Demidetskiy]

[Text] Kishinev May 14 TASS—A proposal on Moldova's secession from the Soviet Union and on the proclamation of a declaration on its independence, which was submitted by the republican people's front at the session of the Moldovan Parliament was not supported by the majority of deputies. The session opened in Kishinev today.

Speaking before the voting on this issue, President of the Moldovan Parliament Alexandru Moshanu stressed that "the debate on this issue is untimely". It will be possible to raise this issue after a republican referendum on independence.

An attempt to put the question on the nationalisation of Moldovan Communist Party property on the session's agenda also failed.

### Moldovan Law on Property

*914106124*

For this law published in the 27 March 1991 SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA, see the JPRS Report Soviet Union: Economic Affairs, JPRS-UEA-91-020, dated 25 April 1991, pages 18-23.

### Ukraine's Fokin To Press for Economic Sovereignty

*LD1405211291 Kiev International Service in English 0000 GMT 14 May 91*

[Text] The Prime Minister of Ukraine, Vitold Fokin, arrived today in Moscow. Together with plenipotentiary representatives of other Union republics, he will take part in discussing the anti-crisis program. This concept of emergency measures was forwarded for taking the Soviet economy out of the deep crisis by the Union Government. At the press department of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, it was anounced that Vitold Fokin will forward a number of proposals at the sitting in

Moscow, which are designed to strengthen the economic sovereignty of Ukraine. This in part includes the transfer of all-union enterprises on its territory to the full jurisdiction of our republic. This also will ensure Ukraine the right to independently manage its financial transactions, and conduct foreign economic activity independently from the center, as well as social policy, maximum orientation to the national interest [as heard].

## Communist Role in Ukraine Legislature Viewed

*91UN1468A Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA in Ukrainian 30 Apr 91 pp 1-2*

[Unattributed interview with V. Lisovenko, secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, under the rubric "Political Microphone"; place and date not given: "The Communists in the Legislature"]

[Text] [RADYANSKA UKRAYINA] Vasyl Trokhymovych, the selection of a secretary of the Central Committee, whose duties include work with the soviets and political and public organizations, first and foremost envisages the strengthening of constructivism in the activities of the communist deputies in the parliament of the Ukraine. But perhaps this step is also the result of the need to design a policy for working with the soviets at all levels.

[Lisovenko] In my opinion, the most pressing problem in the construction of a modern party is to work out a concept for interaction between the party and other political forces under the conditions of a multiparty system. Its essence is cooperation and struggle, alliance and compromise. Out of 15 parties that have announced themselves recently in the Ukraine, some are already represented in the republic's Supreme Soviet. As a result, it is clear that the Ukrainian Communist Party should manifest its role as society's vanguard force through its parliamentary activities. And this is not reinventing the wheel. After all, with its victory in the elections the party received a mandate to act in the name of the majority of the voters.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee has already created a Commission for Ties With the Soviets and Political and Public Organizations. Its goal is to be a coordinating center for party work with communist deputies and to contribute to the preparation of recommendations, proposals, etc. It does not impose prepared rulings or try to command; it is supposed to help representatives of the party perform their work aggressively, competently, and, as a result, more effectively.

As for the positions of Communists in the soviets at all levels, they should be worked out at the local level proceeding from the specific conditions and the guiding political line of the party.

Someone once observed correctly that "politics is a sober business and does not tolerate hallucinations." Concerning the politics of the party in the work of the soviets, I believe that it consists today of rallying and directing all social forces toward an improved life for the people.

[RADYANSKA UKRAYINA] Ambitious and systematic work by the communist deputies in the soviets at all levels is a requirement dictated by life. Hence the necessity to broaden perestroyka in the activities of the party committees. True, even today one meets with attempts to preserve functions within the party structures that do not belong to them. In conjunction with this, what kind of tasks are facing you, as a secretary who is involved with working with the soviets?

[Lisovenko] The guiding documents for the Ukrainian Communist Party are the rulings of the 28th congress and the policy worked out there. And naturally we put it into practice through our Communists, including members of the CPSU who are deputies. For specific examples I will turn to the first stage of the 28th congress.

Along with other documents, the congress adopted a resolution on state sovereignty of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] which charged communist deputies with taking an active part in the development by the Supreme Soviet of a declaration on state sovereignty and a draft of the Union treaty. In July the declaration was adopted by the Supreme Soviet. This is a genuinely historic action. In it are the expectations and the will of the people. They will be approved by a referendum.

I say this not to "take credit" from anyone but to confirm that in serious matters the party not only feels the pulse of public life but is capable of expressing the will of the people. In the interests of the people work has also been underway in the Ukrainian Communist Party on a draft of the Union treaty. It is now being completed by the people's deputies.

Further examples of this approach can also be seen in measures to resolve the problems of the countryside, to clean up the Chernobyl disaster, and other complicated issues. At the same time, I have reason to agree that some party committees are even now trying to perform functions that do not belong to them. In all fairness, I will say that this is being done with the best intentions; that is, it is not taking place for our benefit. I again cite the documents of our congress—the resolution "Communists of the Ukraine and Soviets of People's Deputies." "The congress has determined that in their organizational efforts individual party committees are contributing insufficiently to the establishment of the soviets as organs of real power, are trying to preserve for themselves the right to make substitutions and to preserve excessive control of them, and are not rendering a proper evaluation of the positions of Communists who demonstrate passivity and indifference in the performance of their duties as deputies." This is also a vivid statement of how difficult the separation of power into legislative, executive, and judicial authority is for us, as well as a

type of answer to the question of the role of the new post in the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

First and foremost I consider it my function, together with party comrades-in-arms via the party committees, to decisively strengthen and, so to say, professionalize the activities of Communists in the soviets. We all have an interest in this and sincerely desire the soviets to become genuine organs of power of the people and work productively for the resolution of those serious problems gripping our republic and the country.

Taking into consideration the fact that members of the CPSU alone make up more than two-thirds of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet and over 52 percent of the local soviets, it is not difficult to realize that the activity of these representative organs of power and, finally, the fate of the country and of perestroyka depends fully on how Communists function in the soviets.

As everyone knows, the 28th Congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party supported reform of the electoral system. Undoubtedly the next elections will be conducted on a multiparty basis. The congress acknowledged that it is necessary to immediately begin political work in preparation for the elections. This means that we need to design a new law and to strengthen the territorial party organizations, enlisting into the work those Communists who are on the party register at enterprises and in organizations.

If one takes into account the fact that my functions as secretary of the Central Committee include ties not only with the soviets but also with the political and public organizations, then this too is part of the circle of tasks with which I must involve myself. In our difficult collaboration with the diverse political groups (and I do not rule out refusing to deal with some of them), we must ensure implementation of Ukrainian sovereignty.

[RADYANSKA UKRAYINA] Vasyl Trokhymovych, I have another somewhat professional question: What do you consider to be the fundamental tasks of those members of the parliament who are Communists?

[Lisovenko] The primary one, in my opinion, is to gain mastery of the method of legislative initiative, first and foremost on such issues as social protection of workers, national revival, education of the younger generation, etc.

Second: They must make better and more clever use of the experience of members of parliaments of foreign countries to increase interaction with the opposition. For the time being we are primarily ruled by emotions rather than arguments. In the process we must also put an end to the manipulation of public opinion.

Third: We must make bolder use of the right of the majority in the parliament. As a result of the efforts of some pseudodemocrats, who have skillfully and spontaneously appropriated the attractive titles of "popular" or "democratic," public opinion often perceives the majority as a bulwark of conservatism and intellectual narrow- mindedness.

A majority is the natural consequence of the choice of the people, and we should make far more effective use of the right we have won, remembering that the position of the majority not only does not reject but even demands aggressive actions.

[RADYANSKA UKRAYINA] At present it is very important in party work not only to correctly evaluate but to correctly predict the development of the political situation. What are the chances that the parliament of the Ukraine will "keep control of" the situation in conjunction with the population's dissatisfaction with the increase in prices?

[Lisovenko] Party work, like any political activity, first and foremost demands the ability to look at events from the position of the masses, to look truth in the eyes, and to foresee the social consequences of the decisions that are being made. In my view one cannot reproach the parliament of the Ukraine with an absence of such an ability. I believe that the government of the republic should have the first say these days; incidentally, the Central Committee plenum dealt with this on 15 April, and a suitable position was worked out in this aspect.

[RADYANSKA UKRAYINA] How do you react to demands circulating for the resignation of the president of the USSR? What is your evaluation of the activities of M.S. Gorbachev at the present stage of perestroyka?

[Lisovenko] I would even say that they are not circulating but are increasing like an avalanche. But that testifies to the fact that, thanks to the agitation of that same M.S. Gorbachev, true democracy is expanding. That is an evaluation of his activities for you... And concerning an evaluation in general, it should only be made once his work has been completed or when it is assigned a certain stage. But in either case, only society and history should give a careful evaluation of such a figure as M.S. Gorbachev. Anything else is only an emotional outburst.

[RADYANSKA UKRAYINA] Returning to the issue of your work in the parliament of the republic, I would like to know your opinion of criticism, as well as attacks against you, by the opposition. Does it hurt the development of your work in the parliament in your new role? And how do you react to such criticism?

[Lisovenko] I view some of it as a malicious attack on my basic position, and I pay no attention to other criticism because it is unfounded, but when there is justified criticism I treat it creatively, analyze it , and draw conclusions. Criticism can hurt if it, in the words of K. Marx, "acts not as the sharp knife of reason but as the dull scissors of arbitrariness, when it wants only to criticize but not be subjected to criticism in turn"... I will only add that I am categorically opposed to unfair methods of political struggle.

[RADYANSKA UKRAYINA] It has already happened more than once that the transfer of a top leader of an oblast to work at the center—the Union or republic center—has led to unforeseen difficulties. Are you confident with the situation in the rear area in Chernigov?

[Lisovenko] Relatively confident. But the situation changes so quickly today that changes, both positive and negative, can occur even without a change of leaders. As a result, it would be shortsighted to be absolutely confident...

[RADYANSKA UKRAYINA] What continues to trouble you today? What would you like to tell the readers of RADYANSKA UKRAYINA and the voters at this difficult time?

[Lisovenko] In a rule-of-law state it is necessary not only to create laws but to present an example of how to fulfill them, not just write it out today, violate it tomorrow, and reap the bitter fruit and heroically overcome the defects the day after... That is not a rule-of-law state.

In recent decades we have been living better than we have been working. We have been living, so to say, in debt. And now this conflict has surfaced, as they say. Under the circumstances that presently exist you cannot create anything useful over the short term. We must gradually change our forms of management and at the same time institute discipline and order and improve the responsibility of citizens before both the state and society.

Some consider the market to be our sole salvation, but it is still necessary to create that market. And on the way we should not tear down everything but rather act in a civilized fashion, replacing the old forms of management and the old production relations with ones that are newer and more modern and that genuinely renew and enrich life. All of the world's states have reached the market in a gradual manner, and only here does one hear demands to "give us a market today." That is adventurism.

As for the opposition, relations do not depend solely on us. My opinion is that conflicts must exist and will exist, but the result of a struggle should not be destruction but rather a search for and discovery of those forms and means of achieving goals which will serve the interests of our people. I am firmly convinced that today's situation demands that opposing forces seek dialogue, achieve compromises, and reject mutual recrimination and political ambition.

In conclusion, there is one more thing. No matter what anyone says, and no matter how crude the lies and slander about the CPSU, the Ukrainian Communist Party, and the Communists, it is impossible to lead the country from the impasse without the active participation of the party.

This is why we need to do everything possible to restore the faith of the people in our position, our conviction, and our practical affairs and to become a consolidating force in a great Rus for the public good.

It is not the first time our Leninist party finds itself in difficult circumstances. It is not the first time people prophesy political doom for it. But we are firmly convinced that the instability and difficulty are a temporary phenomenon. The party has enough strength and endurance to surmount these difficulties.

## Stepan Khmara Trial Postponed in Ukraine

*LD1405211991 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1700 GMT 14 May 91*

[Report by correspondent Mykola Knyazhinskiy in Kiev; From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] It was tense today in Kiev and in other cities in the Ukraine. The trial of Stepan Khmara, people's deputy of the republic, was to have opened today, but it was postponed until tomorrow at the last minute. A 300,000-strong meeting has already taken place in Kiev in support of Khmara. Calls are being made for a general strike.

[Knyazhinskiy] The Stepan Khmara case has been troubling the republic since last November, giving rise to meetings and demonstrations in various Ukrainian cities such as this, which turned into a march on the (Yanovskaya) prison where Khmara was held. On 7 November 1990 Stepan Khmara took part in a fight and in the detention of Militia Colonel Grigoryev, defending a woman protesting against the holding of an October Revolution demonstration in Kiev. Today many people in the Ukraine say that this was a planned provocation. Khmara, however, undoubtedly fell for it. In prison Khmara repeatedly declared a hunger strike. Following his release and pending his trial the people's deputy went to the striking miners of Donetsk, where he as once again arrested and jailed.

Protesting against the repressions against Khmara, deputies of the People's Council [Narodna Rada] minority have repeatedly walked out of parliament. We are willing to participate in dialogue and cooperation with sovereign communists, that is to say communists who are in favor of the independence of the republic only after Khmara has been fully rehabilitated, the democrats say. Otherwise we will apply extra-legislative pressure.

## Belorussian Decree on April 91 Strikes

*91UN1477 Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 27 Apr 91 p 1*

[Decree of the Presidium of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet "On the Situation in the Republic in Connection with the Organization and Conduct of Rallies and Strikes in April 1991"]

[Text] Having heard the information of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Procuracy, the Belorussian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the Belorussian SSR Committee for State Security in connection with the organization and conduct of rallies and strikes in April 1991, the Presidium of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet notes that the leaders and officials of enterprises and organizations, local soviets of people's deputies, and the law enforcement organs of the Belorussian SSR did not employ all the necessary measures in the republic to safeguard law and order and the normal rhythm of work of the national economy.

The Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers, the Minsk City Soviet of People's Deputies, and other local soviets of people's deputies, and their executive and administrative organs, are not introducing specific proposals to improve the socio-economic situation in the republic in a timely way, they are avoiding directing state organs subordinate to them and influencing the labor collectives of enterprises and organizations located on their territory, and they do not ensure compliance with the Belorussian SSR Constitution, the laws of the republic, and their own decisions in a proper way.

Explanatory work on the essence of the decisions adopted by the Presidium of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet and the Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers on the social protection of the population under the conditions of the republic's transition to market relations and the conduct of price reform is being conducted feebly. Production and labor discipline has deteriorated considerably, and labor productivity has fallen. The conduct of rallies and strikes has caused substantial economic damage. The managers of individual enterprises and organizations do not control the situation, and they are not taking steps to find opportunities for additional social protection of members of their labor collectives and to apply established laws to persons who violate legislation on labor.

Taking advantage of the difficult economic situation resulting from reforms in retail prices, errors made and defects in the matter of social protection of the population, and the aloofness of individual managers from decisions that are inevitable during the transition to the market, certain leaders of the strike movement are trying to resolve economic and political questions by illegitimate methods and are calling for the dissolution of legally elected higher organs of state authority and administration. The destructive processes they are encouraging lead to chaos and catastrophe and place the republic's economy in a hopeless position, which in the final analysis will have an effect on the welfare of each citizen. Responsibility for inflaming these negative processes is borne first and foremost by the organizers of strikes and unsanctioned rallies.

The Presidium of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet **decrees**:

1. The Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers will analyze thoroughly the situation associated with the conduct of rallies and strikes in April 1991 and it will take additional measures without delay to stabilize the socio-economic situation, to protect the rights of citizens and the interests of the republic, to safeguard property and public order, and to saturate the republic's domestic market with food and industrial commodities in daily demand.

2. The Procuracy of the Belorussian SSR (Comrade G.S. Tarnavskiy), the Belorussian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs (Comrade V.D. Yegorov), and the Belorussian SSR Committee for State Security (Comrade Z.I. Shirkovskiy) will ensure rigorous execution of legislation in effect.

3. The Minsk City Soviet of People's Deputies, other local soviets of people's deputies, and their executive and administrative organs will study the situation in each work collective and oblige the managers of enterprises and organizations, in accordance with legislation, to conduct the necessary work on improving wages, taking into account the increase in the volume of production and services, on additional social protection of members of labor collectives, on strengthening production and work discipline, and on cessation of illegal rallies and strikes. If needed, they will submit proposals to appropriate organs concerning the discharge of such managers and officials from the positions they hold.

[Signed] N. Dementey, chairman of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet

24 April 1991, City of Minsk

## Caucasus

### Continuing Reportage on South Ossetian Problem

#### State of Emergency Declared

*LD1505100491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0949 GMT 15 May 91*

[By unidentified TASS correspondent]

[Text] Tbilisi, 15 May (TASS)—A decision by the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia declaring a state of emergency in the town of Tskhinvali, where there is a continuing confrontation between the Georgian and Ossetian populations, has been published here today. In reporting on this, SAKINFORM News Agency writes that it was introduced late yesterday evening and is to last for a month. The curfew hours have been set for 2200 to 0700.

### 'Transported' S. Ossetians Noted

*LD1405173591 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1400 GMT 14 May 91*

[Text] As before, there is still a difficult situation in the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast. Repair work continues in the town of Tskhinvali and adjacent areas. In the last 24 hours more than 1,000 people have been transported to various rayons of the oblast, accompanied by servicemen of the Internal Troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

### Presence of USSR Troops Protested

*AU1405081691 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 23 Apr 91 p 1*

[Letter from M. Omanidze, first deputy chairman of the Georgian Government, to V.Kh. Doguzhiyev, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Interrepublican Commission; date not given]

[Text] The bringing in of punitive detachments of the USSR Interior Ministry Internal Troops to the territory of Samachablo (the former South Ossetian Autonomous Region) is a most blatant interference into the internal affairs of the sovereign Republic of Georgia. With the support of the troops, the so-called "National Salvation Committee" was created. This committee, having ignored the authority of D. Kekenadze, the lawful procurator of Tskhinvali, illegally appointed the "self-styled" "procurator" A. Pukhayev. In violation of law, the latter arrested 23 Georgian citizens and does not let a lawyer talk to them. The troops are giving every support to the extremists and are oppressing the Georgian population. All of this gave rise to strikes and actions of protest on the part of the political organizations within the "Roundtable-Free Georgia" bloc expressing the will of the entire Georgian population.

The goal of the aforementioned actions was this: To put an end to the arbitrary rule of the central imperial authorities in Georgia, to promote the process of formation of a sovereign democratic state, and to restore full and genuine independence of Georgia.

The entire responsibility for the failure to fulfill the aforementioned demands and for the failure to resolve the problems, which we have listed above, falls completely on the supreme state power of the USSR.

[signed] M. Omanidze, First Deputy Chairman of the Government of the Republic of Georgia.

### Georgian Presidential Election Schedule Detailed

*AU1305154991 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 23 Apr 91 p 1*

["From the Central Electoral Commission of the Republic of Georgia Presidential Elections. On the Schedule of Georgian Presidential Elections to be Held on 26 May 1991;" date not given]

[Text] In accordance with the Law of the Republic of Georgia "on the Elections of the President of the Republic of Georgia," the Central Electoral Commission of the Republic of Georgia Presidential Elections **resolves**:

1. The Central Electoral Commission will receive applications from parties, electoral blocs, and groups of electors on the nomination of presidential candidates of the Republic of Georgia (with the right to collect lists of those persons who support the candidates for presidency) not later than 1800 GMT on 23 April 1991.

2. To submit lists of persons supporting the presidential candidates to the Central Electoral Commission not later than 1800 GMT on 2 May 1991.

3. To check the lists of persons supporting the presidential candidates and, if there are inaccuracies in them, to return them for correction within five days from the date of their presentation, but not later than 1800 GMT on 7 May 1991.

4. To submit the revised lists of persons supporting the presidential candidates to the Central Electoral Commission within five days from the date of returning the lists, but not later than 1800 GMT on 12 May 1991.

5. The Central Electoral Commission must ensure that the registration of the presidential candidates and the issuing of certificates to them be completed within three days from the date of submitting the revised lists, but not later than 1800 GMT on 13 May 1991.

6. To initiate the campaign on the election of presidential candidates on 14 May 1991 and complete it by 2000 GMT on 25 May 1991.

[signed] A. Chirakadze, Chairman of the Central Electoral Commission of the Republic of Georgia Presidential Elections.

### Final Six Candidates for Presidential Election

*AU1405090791 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Georgian 0200 GMT 14 May 91*

[Text] From the Central Electoral Commission:

The sixth and final candidate for the Republic of Georgia presidential election which is to be held on 26 May this year is Batono [Georgian polite form of address] Tamaz Kvachantiradze, editor-in-chief of the journal BALAVARI and senior lecturer at Tbilisi State University.

Last Saturday, the Central Electoral Commission registered him as a presidential candidate after the Georgian Free Democratic Union which had nominated him had presented the completed list of electors supporting his candidacy. Thus, all the candidates for the post of president have been determined.

We remind you that the list is headed by Zviad Gamsakhurdia, the president of the Republic of Georgia, who

was the first to be registered by the commission; he is speaker for the Roundtable and chairman of the Georgian Helsinki Union and the Society of St. Ilia the Righteous and has been nominated by parties and organizations making up the Roundtable—Free Georgia bloc.

The other presidential candidates are:

Irakli Shengelia—president of the intellectual association Free Thought; he has been nominated by the Democratic Choice for Georgia (DASI) organization, the Liberal Democratic National Party, and the Christian Democratic Union all of which form part of the Freedom bloc;

Jimi Mik'eladze—first secretary of the Central Committee of the Georgian Independent Communist Party; he has been nominated by the latter;

Valerian Advadze—chairman of the board of the Georgian Union of National Accord and Rebirth; he has been nominated by the latter;

Nodar Nat'adze—chairman of the board of the Georgian People's Front; he has been nominated by the latter and also by a group of electors from the Georgian Republican Party.

## Georgian Presidential Candidate in Militia Raid

*PM1405102291 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 May 91 Union Edition p 2*

["Direct Line" report by Besik Urigashvili from Tbilisi: "Presidential Candidate's Headquarters Stormed"]

[Text] At 0200 hours on 12 May the militia stormed the headquarters of Georgian presidential candidate Professor Valerian Advadze.

The official version of the storming of the headquarters, which is located at the Institute of Planning and Management of the National Economy, of which Advadze is director, was to uncover the identities of four of his bodyguards.

According to spokesmen for the republic MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], the fulfillment of these requirements was hampered by a group of people supporting Advadze in the election contest, and that is why it was necessary to resort to such an extreme step. This group also included another presidential candidate, albeit not yet registered—the writer Tamaz Kvachantiradze; movie director Revaz Chkheidze; writer Chabua Amiredzhibi; Roman Mimmoshvili, editor of the journal LITERATURNAYA GRUZIYA; and certain others. There were casualties among them; in particular, Amiredzhibi was badly beaten up, and Professor Guram Koranashvili's arm was broken. There were also casualties among the assault party.

Advadze's seized bodyguards say they are Moscow Criminal Investigations Department employees who, in their free time, provide a guard for private individuals within the framework of their "Zayavka" cooperative, and who are currently on leave. The contract with Advadze was concluded for a month. After a time the detainees were released.

In the evening, speaking on Georgian television during the time alloted to presidential candidates, Advadze resolutely protested the militia's actions. He said that last fall, during the legislative elections, an attack involving firearms was carried out at his apartment. I am entitled, Advadze said, to distrust the militia now that its faith is pledged to one presidential candidate—the republic's current president, Zviad Gamsakhurdia. In these conditions, with, as Advadze sees it, a powerful propaganda machine and the law enforcement organs working for Gamsakhurdia, it is pointless for the other candidates to take part in the election.

Spokesmen for the MVD and the prosecutor's office then spoke on television. The MVD spokesman said that Advadze's guards are not Moscow Criminal Investigations Department employees at all, but KGB workers, and that their documents may be forged. The prosecutor's office spokesman stated that the Georgian militia acted within the law.

This was followed by an announcer-read text, which said that anyone resorting to the services of agents of a foreign state has no right to be a citizen of Georgia, let alone a presidential candidate.

## Georgian Presidential Candidate Criticized

*LD1405142691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1000 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS correspondent Albert Kochetkov]

[Text] Tbilisi, 14 May (TASS)—Valerian Advadze, a candidate for the post of President of Georgia, has hired personal bodyguards from a private detective agency in Moscow. He is the leader of the Alliance for National Concord and Rebirth of Georgia and a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Valerian Advadze was forced to hire personal bodyguards following an unsuccessful attempt on his life in October last year, when shots were fired at his apartment from an automatic weapon. His four bodyguards are Russian militia officers who moonlight for a private detective agency. Their nationality and other job have been used to try to discredit the candidate.

The official Georgian television station has called Valerian Advadze's decision "unpatriotic." The television hinted that his bodyguards are "KGB employees" and that the presidential candidate—the elections are to be held on 26 May—is "an agent of the Kremlin."

Valerian Advadze has not yet responded to these allegations. Observers consider that this attempt to discredit him has been organized by Zviad Gamsakhurdia, the

current President of Georgia, to whom he is a dangerous rival. Evidently the information leaked by the television about Valerian Advadze's bodyguards could only have been gathered by surveillance of him, eavesdropping on telephone conversations, and listening in on the presidential candidate's office and apartment.

## Georgian Foreign Minister on Visit to France

*AU1405201791 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 26 Apr 91 p 1*

[By SAKINFORM special correspondent Devi Berdzenishvili]

[Text] Moscow, 24 April—Today Georgiy Khoshtaria, minister of foreign affairs of the Republic of Georgia, gave a news conference in the "Mziuri" Georgian Cultural Center. Archil Chirakadze, chairman of the Georgian Central Electoral Commission, also took part in the news conference.

The reason for holding the news conference was the foreign minister's recent visit to France However, it was mainly concerned with the present situation in Georgia and the attitude of the political forces in France to the processes taking place in Georgia.

Mr. Georgiy Khoshtaria said that the situation in the republic is strained, and that this is due to the antagonism between the center and the forces striving to resolve the pressing issues in a just manner. For Georgia, the confrontation had resulted, in particular, in an economic blockade and provocations, which were also the reason for the conflict in Shida Kartli [area of Georgia into which South Ossetia has been incorporated by the Georgian Government]. Strikes were one of the few possible ways to react to these sanctions. Accordingly railroad, road, and water transportation services are on strike in the republic, and those enterprises that are under Union jurisdiction are not operating.

In the minister's opinion, such a situation is more or less typical of many regions in the USSR. The only solution here is to renouce the vertical structure of state, which will qualitatively change the situation in the republics, irrespective of whether they remain within the Soviet Union or secede from it.

Georgiy Khoshtaria said that while in France he encountered diametrically opposed attitudes to these problems. Some representatives of official circles continue to believe in Gorbachev's policy, considering that it is a guarantee for general stability. However, many politicians support the democratic changes.

During his visit to France Georgiy Khoshtaria did his best to oppose with the truth the stream of lies with which the central mass media are swamping the Western reader. Thanks to his good contacts with French publishers, he succeeded in many cases in achieving the desired results.

## Georgian Minister Protests to USSR Counterpart

*AU1005193791 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 23 Apr 91 p 1*

[Letter from Dilar Khabuliani, Republic of Georgia minister of internal affairs, to Boris Karlovich Pugo, USSR minister of internal affairs; date not given]

[Text] Esteemed Boris Karlovich,

As reported earlier, the Internal Troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD], who were sent into the former South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast without the consent of the legislature, Government, or MVD of the sovereign Republic of Georgia; they have committed a number of acts of tyranny, violence and unlawful actions by disarming and detaining Georgian militia officers who were outside the area covered by the state of emergency. In addition, the Internal Troops have made unlawful searches of citizens' houses, have illegally detained civilians, desecrated holy places, and committed other unlawful deeds.

Sensing the open support of the Internal Troops, the Ossetian separatists have stepped up their activities. On 13 April 1991 they attacked the supply headquarters of the Georgian MVD and subjected the Georgian village of Ksuisi to rocket fire. On the same day, two people of Georgian nationality were killed and another two Georgians were taken hostage in the presence of members of the Internal Troops. One of the hostages was returned badly beaten up, while the fate of the other is unknown. In the city of Tskhinvali there is continued looting and burning of houses belonging to Georgians.

The Committee of National Salvation, which was set up by dubious persons, has trampled on all norms of existing legislation by appointing as procurators of the oblast and Tskhinvali Rayon persons who compromised themselves and had already been dismissed from the procuracy—Robert Biazrov and Aron Pukhayev. That same committee appointed a chief of the Tskhinvali Rayon Internal Affairs Department, although the rayon has both a procurator and a chief of militia who were appointed by legal procedures.

The above could not but anger the entire population of Georgia, and has led to the declaration of a national strike whose chief demand is the withdrawal of the USSR MVD Internal Troops from the former South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast.

The leadership of the Republic of Georgia MVD considers that there were every grounds for the people to be angry and for the above action to be carried out.

For our part, we wish to draw your urgent attention to these matters, and demand a response to certain scandalous acts committed by the Internal Troop units or with their support.

In particular, the attitude by commanders of the contingent of Internal Troops toward the commandant and

other officers of the Georgian militia appointed by the Georgian MVD continues to be one of arrogance.

The special investigation team sent in by the USSR MVD maintains no contact whatever with the republican MVD or its relevant departments. As a result, we do not know how objectively the numerous crimes committed in the region are being investigated.

This attitude by the USSR MVD has virtually tied the hands of the investigation team of the Georgian Procuracy and MVD which began operating in December of last year.

As has already been reported to you, an active part in the attack by the Internal Troops against the Georgian militia on 10 April 1991 in the village of Okona in the former Znaurskiy Rayon was taken by the former deputy chief of the Znaurskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Department, L.V. Dzhioyev, who had been dismissed from the internal affairs department and who had taken part in the theft by Ossetian extremists of 17 submachine guns from the rayon internal affairs department.

We are particularly indignant, and regard it as criminal, that the investigation into the case of the 23 detained Georgian citizens, including two militia officers—Damir Gogiya and Aleksiy Gusharashvili—and a cadet from the republican higher militia school, Malkhaz Datashvili, was entrusted to the recently and unlawfully appointed procurator of Tskhinvali Rayon, Aron Pukhayev—a man who in the past was dismissed from the procuracy for violating ethical standards and inciting interethnic discord. A person with his qualities cannot be objective, and this is now being proved by the specific action he is taking. According to our information, A. Pukhayev is using the testimony of false witnesses and doing everything he can to make the situation that the detained people are in more grave.

While all this is taking place, out of the 12 extremists of Ossetian nationality who were detained by the Internal Troops on 10 April, 11 have been released. It is quite possible that the seven extremists (four of whom were from North Ossetia) who were detained on 13 April during an attack on the Internal Troops and a Georgian militia headquarters will also be released.

How can such people who have compromised themselves be entrusted with investigating such a complex, serious and delicate matter? How can they be entrusted with the fate of others?

We categorically demand that corresponding orders be given for the command of the contingent of Internal Troops to establish proper contact with the military commandant appointed by the Georgian MVD, and that it take joint action with him to normalize the situation. We also demand that the special investigation team inform us about the investigations they are pursuing, and that in future they operate jointly with the special investigation team of the Georgian Procuracy and MVD. The fabrication of charges against unlawfully detained Georgian citizens and Georgian militia officers must be stopped, and the Ossetian extremists must be afforded no protection or help to evade criminal liability.

[Signed] **Dilar KHABULIANI,**
**Republic of Georgia Minister of Internal Affairs.**

## Georgian Government Chairman on Economy

*AU1305060191 Tbilisi SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA in Georgian 17 Apr 91 p 1*

[Interview with Tengis Sigua, chairman of the Government of the Republic of Georgia, by TV journalist Merab Beradze: "We Have Grounds for Being Optimistic"]

[Text] **In the interview with Tengis Sigua, chairman of the Government of the Republic of Georgia, by TV correspondent Merab Beradze, topical and important issues relating to our republic's economy are raised. We offer a shorthand transcript of the interview.**

[Beradze] Perhaps, this is not a very accurate comparison but, for many reasons, it seems to me that our economy resembles that ailing suckling who first has to be cured and then taught to walk.

[Sigua] Yes, the situation is exactly like that. During the last few years, the Soviet economy which, for 70 years, has been based on a planned centralized system has been experiencing an acute crisis. Being a part of this system, we, of course, caught this illness and, therefore, following the victory of democratic forces in the elections of 28 October, the first question to be put on the agenda was precisely that of the dismantlement of the existing system in a very short period of time and the construction of a new economic system. I believe that our fellow citizens observed that, in the initial period, we began the formalization of direct agreements with the republics. This was the first step. We formalized direct agreements with Estonia, the Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, and Moldova. This process is continuing. The situation today has convinced us that this is the right step because the center is, for all intents and purposes, no longer supplying the republic. For example, during January and February, we received virtually no wheat, forage, and medicines. We did not receive any milk products including butter. However, the agreements that we have concluded with the republics are, for all intents and purposes, in operation and it is precisely they that helped us to survive this winter's crisis. On the other hand, we should already begin to look more actively for a new alternative market. In this respect, during the last two or three months, a considerable amount of work has been done. We are formalizing agreements with a number of countries in Europe, Asia, and Africa. We have already concluded preliminary agreements in order to receive food products from Germany and Kenya. We are currently drawing up an agreement with the Italians that envisages the active participation of their firms in the construction of roads in our country and in the implementation of work aimed at expanding and reconstructing our airports and seaports. We have on the

agenda questions concerning the complete modernization of our agriculture and the acquisition and installation of new automatic production lines for the reprocessing of agricultural produce. It will then be necessary to attract Western capital on a wide scale in order to develop our economy.

[Beradze] Batono [Georgian polite form of address] Tengis, I will again return to the market, to the question that worries us. One research worker told me recently: "When, in the morning, my wife tells me that I have to go to the market, I imagine myself as Othello and am ready to strangle her...." So, again, I return to the subject that is a worry to us: our rising prices, the market, the permanent shortage of goods....

[Sigua] I have said from the very beginning that the point is that, as yet, we have not been able to protect the economic frontiers of our republic. As yet, we have not got our own customs although we are now actively engaged in drafting a law on the creation of a Georgian customs. Of course, this involves great expense. Presently, we have customs only in Batumi, Poti, and Tbilisi. We need to create a broad customs' network. We have to control all routes, both road and rail and also air and sea. I believe that, by the end of this year, this work will basically be done and we will then be able to protect our economic frontiers and no longer be dependent on the all-Union market.

Regarding price increases, could we—by we, I mean the republic—have avoided this step? Of course not. What would have happened? If we had kept the old prices, our market would have been completely emptied within two or three days; I repeat, in view of the fact that we are presently unable to protect our economic frontiers, the population of neighboring republics would have rushed to our markets and laid waste to them. Therefore, we were obliged to raise prices in accordance with the all-Union resolution. We have to admit that, presently, we find ourselves in very difficult conditions because, as a subsidized republic with regard to such basic food products as food-quality and feed grains, we annually import 1,800,000 tonnes. In addition, we buy from outside the republic 260,000 tonnes of sugar, 1,000,040 tonnes of milk products in milk equivalent, 80,000 tonnes of meat, and also other products.

[Beradze] Yesterday, we were talking about meat. Can you offer some reassurance on this?

[Sigua] This is how the matter stands. Agreements have been formalized with the FRG and Kenya for the supply of meat and butter. Two refrigerator ships are already on their way to Kenya to bring the first consignment of meat and butter.

[Beradze] When do you expect them to return?

[Sigua] We expect these goods in Poti after 20 April; this will significantly ease the strained situation in our internal market regarding these products.

[Beradze] How much will we receive?

[Sigua] In accordance with the agreement that has been signed with Kenya, the republic should receive, in all, 33,000 tonnes of meat and 22,500 tonnes of butter. This is a very significant fact and we hope that, already from May, we will be able to satisfy the needs of the population regarding these basic food products.

[Beradze] Will we have the same ration coupons, Batono Tengis?

[Sigua] Yes. Evidently, in the initial period, we will be obliged to use ration coupons in order to regulate the situation. As you know, throughout 1990, only once—one month only—was meat sold for ration coupons and, as yet, this year it has not been on sale. However, we hope that, from May, this will already be possible.

[Beradze] According to the principle of fair distribution?

[Sigua] Absolutely. In addition, we are formalizing or, to be more accurate, we have already formalized, as I have said, an agreement with the FRG for the supply of basic foodstuffs—butter, milk powder, and meat.

[Beradze] Belgium was mentioned....

[Sigua] Negotiations are in progress with Belgium for the purchase of butter and milk powder. However, if we are to think about the future, it seems to me that, in principle, this path is not the right one. We must acquire modern automatic production lines and installations and we should create a base for the expansion of production of these goods in our republic. We recently held talks with representatives of the Maltese Order. This is the world's oldest charitable commercial firm; with its support, we hope to obtain very large credit from Western banks and, on its basis, create an industrial base for the republic and, first and foremost, a base for processing agricultural products from the point of view of the mechanization of agriculture and an increase in per capita power consumption. We will not achieve very much if, each year, we import into the republic basic food products in the amounts already mentioned. We ourselves should create such a base of food products that will reduce to a minimum their import from outside the republic and, through sale of the goods produced, enable us to acquire modern equipment.

[Beradze] Batono Tengis, it is from you that I know this, and it is for this reason only that I now dare state the following before such a wide audience: As soon as we start receiving large quantities of meat reserves from abroad, it will be sold for much less than 12 rubles [R]. However, today, we are faced with a rather strange fact: The Union indicator for the sale of meat will be nine rubles whereas in our country it will be R12. How do you explain this?

[Sigua] Yes. On the surface, it seems that we will be selling meat to our population at a much higher price than it will be sold for in other republics. However, we have a completely different aim in mind that I would like

once again to explain. The point is that no matter what price we set for meat today, there virtually isn't any to be had. There is no meat in the shops; it is only on sale in the market and at a fairly high price. This morning, I specially asked our colleagues about this and they informed me that meat in the market already costs R35.

Let me now tell you the idea behind our pricing meat at R12. Proceeding from the laws of market economics, there is an inflow of a particular type of product to the place where it costs more. Therefore, we expect that, in the near future, before we are importing meat from abroad, our markets will be receiving meat from other regions of the country.

[Beradze] Can we count on that?

[Sigua] Of course. This is a simple law of market economics: more goods flow onto the market when prices are high. It is precisely on account of this that we want to reduce the price of meat—from R35 to R20-25. Of course, this price will fall once we're buying meat from abroad. Meat will be sold to the population for coupons probably at a maximum price of seven to eight rubles. It will be sold for this price in budget-carried organizations—schools, hospitals, kindergardens, and so forth.

[Beradze] What about milk?

[Sigua] The situation is the same regarding milk. However, the population will be fully compensated for milk products.

[Beradze] Batono Tengis, is there a guarantee that the population will be supplied with meat in the years to come?

[Sigua] Of course. As I have already said, our first program is to provide the maximum amount of food products to the population. Within the framework of this program, apart from what I have already mentioned, an agreement is being formalized for the purchase of a large quantity of rice from abroad, specifically, from the United States. In addition, we are negotiating with a number of European countries for the purchase of milk powder. Although, presently, we have sufficient supplies of it, this should not give us too much grounds for hope because, as I have already said, the center is gradually halting its deliveries to us and the agreement that we concluded with the center is, for all intents and purposes, not being fulfilled. Evidently, deliveries will be completely halted in the future. Therefore, we should principally orient ourselves toward new alternative markets and these will be the European countries and the Near East and African states. Of course, it will take time to resolve this problem. Therefore, I would like to address our population and thank them very much for the fact that, in spite of the cold and hungry winter, the Council of Ministers did not receive a single complaint. In all honesty, I was expecting an angry reaction from people. When we were experiencing an energy crisis, I was no longer sure that the population would endure the cold winter so patiently. On behalf of the Council of Ministers and the Government, I would like to thank all our population very much for its support and patience as, I repeat once more that, in spite of the great problems of this difficult winter, the Council of Ministers did not receive a single complaint. Therefore, our energy is increased tenfold by the fact that the population of the republic is with us but, of course, this does not mean at all that we will keep people in such a situation next year and in subsequent years. We will do everything, we will take all the necessary measures to ensure that, from the autumn of 1991 and, in 1992, there is a significant improvement in the economic situation for our people. There will be. The most important thing now is that agriculture does not let us down. There was a danger of this happening and we heard rumors that the peasants were, for all intents and purposes, not working. However, we held meetings in Telavi for the whole eastern zone and in Batumi for the western zone. I was personally flown by helicopter over a number of regions in eastern Georgia, in particular, Kakhet'i and, to tell the truth, I have remained satisfied: The vineyards have been attended to and not one dot of land has been left uncultivated; the peasants have been supplied with seeds. Therefore, I expect the 1991 harvest to be a normal one, provided, of course, that the climatic conditions will be in our favor. This will provide us with the base from which, in 1992, we will be able to put a halt to that catastrophic decline that we have witnessed in our agriculture during these last few years and, by the end of 1992, we will even be able to achieve an increase in agricultural production. Once again, I thank the Georgian population for their support that we have continually felt.

[Beradze] Batono Tengis, don't you get the impression that, when speaking of Georgia, we, for some reason, have been ashamed to admit that it ought to have been a country oriented toward agriculture?

[Sigua] Not at all. We are, in the first instance, precisely an agrarian country; our agricultural output occupies a leading position in the republic's overall [trade] balance. Moreover, the output of the food industry forms precisely that base that, in the near future, should raise us to an appropriate economic level. If we do not achieve this, the situation will not improve. Therefore, those Western investments that we will attract will, for the most part, be chanelled in this direction. Regarding the second direction, I am not in favor of the development of powerful industrial factories and metal-intensive production. This is not the right path.

[Beradze] Despite the fact that you yourself are a metallurgist?

[Sigua] Yes, of course. Given the type of country Georgia is, we want to mainly develop precision machine building and instrument making. We have the base for this; we have at our disposition fairly well-qualified cadres and we also have a high scientific level. As proof of this, we can point to the concrete example of the development of arsenic. We have fairly rich deposits of

arsenic and their correct utilization should serve as one of the fundamental conditions for the development of the production of science-intensive electronics and optoelectronics.

These and other deposits represent pure hard currency. God gave us more than our fair share of such riches. Their utilization will further the development of our future exact sciences and technologies.

[Beradze] Batono Tengis, whether we want to or not, we cannot get away from the problem that, today, the republic is in extreme need of hard currency. What has interested me very much from our conversation today are those $900,000 that the republic could acquire as a result of joint output at factories producing sanitary engineering equipment.

[Sigua] The creation of joint enterprises is a more promising way of being able to introduce high technology into our country in an extremely short period of time. Our meeting with the Italian firm is precisely one example of this. It is well known that the quality level of sanitary engineering products is extremely poor both throughout the Union and also in our country. Therefore, the introduction of such high technology and the creation of joint sanitary engineering equipment is essential for us and is also promising from the point of view of its sale on the foreign market. The project presented by the Italian firm corresponds to the level of the present-day demands of the world market and I have no doubt that its implementation will be a highly profitable business for the republic.

[Beradze] I presume that Italian sanitary engineering will be leak-free?

[Sigua] Italian sanitary engineering should not result in any leaks. Incidentally, while on the subject of water, it is consumed economically throughout the world. We should conserve this valuable asset. In the near future, water, by which I mean drinking and spring water and not mineral, will be in very short supply. This is a most acute problem in a whole number of regions in the world such as in the Near East, Asia, and in such an industrially developed country as Japan. God himself gave us this wealth and, therefore, we should adopt a more thrifty attitude toward it. A number of firms have already applied to bottle drinking water and sell it outside the republic. In the near future, a liter of water will cost as much as a liter of oil. With this in mind, we should consume it extremely economically.

[Beradze] Batono Tengis, when will we see the practical results of all this?

[Sigua] The results of all this, more specifically, the initial results will be known by the end of this year. We will not be excessively optimistic and I do not wish to raise people's hopes and confirm that in three or four years time, in accordance with our economic potential, we will reach the average level of European countries. No, this will not happen. Step by step, we have to go through all those stages that the European countries went through during the transition to a market economy. According to my calculations—this is my personal opinion—we will need three or four years in order to completely dismantle the existing economic system and transfer to new economic bases and then the economic level of the republic will gradually improve. I estimate that it will take us at least five to seven years before we attain the average European level.

[Beradze] Batono Tengis, Georgia has embarked upon a difficult path. Let us reassure ourselves that the sun will shine for us tomorrow and the day after....

[Sigua] Indeed. We have to be optimistic. We have grounds for being so. God has given us, it is true, a small country but one that has fairly fertile ground and splendid climatic conditions. He has also not been sparing in supplying us with water and water resources. God has given us all this and, now, what is necessary is that we organize ourselves into an industrious nation. This misfortune still remains with us. We've been trained not to work; we haven't been working normally for 70 years....

[Beradze] Yet, we built Vardzia, Iqalt'o, Nikortsminda, and Alaverdi [historical sites and monuments] without the Kremlin's help....

[Sigua] Without these roots there would be no future. The work ethic lies precisely in a Georgian's roots. He has to have normal economic conditions in order to work. When I mentioned earlier four or five years, this is exactly the period of time required in order to restore a love of work and it is the transfer to a market economy that will create the real conditions for a love of work. We know very well that remuneration of labor in our country was at the lowest level and, therefore, a worker was not interested in normal work. The creation of joint enterprises has moral aspects in addition to purely commercial ones: When our producers establish contacts with German, Italian, and Japanese enterprises or with others in countries with a modern standard of living, I believe there will be an increase in the standard of our labor. That is to say, our very first task is to train specialists and increase the standard of labor. I have no doubt that a Georgian is capable of doing this given his natural capabilities.

[Beradze] Once again allow me to thank you Batono Tengis. We leave you with good hopes.

## Internal Troops' Actions in NKAO Explained

*LD1405163991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1347 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS special correspondent Vladimir Gondusovz]

[Text] Stepanakert, 14 May (TASS)—The increased activity of the forces of law and order in Nagorno-Karabakh (Azerbaijan) has sown panic among the Armenian population. Rumors have begun to circulate about

forthcoming mass deportations of people of that nationality. At the request of the TASS correspondent, a spokesman for the command of the state of emergency area in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and adjoining areas of the Republic of Azerbaijan provided an explanation on this.

"All fanciful ideas that subunits of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops are going to carry out deportation of the local population or play a part in carrying out other functions which are not their own are groundless," he stressed. "The troops are not waging a struggle against the people. Their purpose, in keeping with the USSR president's decree on disarming illegal formations, is to track down and disarm criminal gangs in the region. It is known that the paramilitary formations have arms stores here. They also have bases from which they mount provocative sorties to fire on peaceful inhabitants and servicemen. It is the paramilitaries themselves who are constantly inflaming the situation in the region. The number of casualties is growing relentlessly. The local population is tired of terror and violence. It is ever more painful for us, too, as representatives of the Internal Troops, to have to send to Russia, Ukraine, Belorussia, and other republics 'funeral notices' announcing the deaths of combat comrades. All patience has its limits."

Various kinds of statements, and still more accusations, addressed to servicemen in the USSR Internal Troops concerning lawless and cruel actions allegedly carried out by them against the civilian population, are slanderous, the commandant's office spokesman stated. "We understand," he said, "that there are moments when a man takes up arms to defend his home and his family. Local law enforcement organs are designed for taking measures in such cases; there exists an appropriate article in the criminal code, and the internal troops have nothing to do with it. But it is quite a different matter when armed formations are based somewhere or other—whether they are uninvited 'guests' from a neighboring republic or home-grown gunmen. There should not be any criminal groups on the long-suffering soil of Nagorno-Karabakh. It is here that the task of the Internal Troops lies, and they will do everything to carry it out."

### Soviet Actions Seen as 'Direct Aggression'

*PM1405100391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 May 91 Union Edition p 2*

[S. Mostovshchikov report: "How the Soviet Army and IZVESTIYA 'Plot' Was Discovered"]

[Text] A news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists took place in the Armenian Council of Ministers Permanent Mission in Moscow 12 May. Those present were provided with a review of events on the Armenian-Azerbaijani border.

Feliks Mamikonyan, Armenia's permanent representative in Moscow, spoke at the news conference. Having described the events of recent days as a direct aggression by the Soviet Union against independent Armenia, he named three different types of warfare which the USSR is waging on his republic. The first type, in Feliks Mamikonyan's opinion, is undisguised state terrorism. The second is psychological warfare, whose aim is to destabilize the situation in Armenia. Finally the third type is information warfare, whose essence boils down to the fact that the official mass media are deliberately misleading the country's population regarding events in the region.

In terms of information sabotage, the speaker's statements were embellished by RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputy Anatoliy Shabad, who toured Armenia's "hot" spots. He got there by joining an RSFSR Supreme Soviet official commission.

The speech made it clear to those attending that IZVESTIYA is one of the "pioneers" of the information war. Anatoliy Shabad carefully analyzed an item in issue No. 111 entitled "Conflict That Turned Into War," which recounted the events of 6 and 7 May in the region of the Armenian village of Voskepar in Armenia's Noyemberyanskiy Rayon. It so happened that Deputy Shabad and Valeriy Reshetnikov, author of the IZVESTIYA item, were in the area of Soviet Army combat operations at the same time.

According to Anatoliy Shabad, the IZVESTIYA item does not correspond to the facts, in that the troops were not fighting the militants at all but were simply conducting an operation to redraw borders, utilizing at least 20 tanks, helicopters, and heavy artillery. Considering that up until now the border has not changed at all, Anatoliy Shabad clarified that he meant redrawing in the hypothetical sense of the word. However, Anatoliy Shabad's version about how, according to him, the military needed to organize a provocation to conduct a "hypothetical redrawing" proved to be far from hypothetical. Moreover, this provocation was allegedly thought up especially to mislead the IZVESTIYA correspondent.

Accusing the military of organizing a provocation especially for IZVESTIYA is a serious matter. The person making such a statement must have incontrovertible proof of the veracity of his words. However, answering an IZVESTIYA correspondent's question, Anatoliy Shabad said that he had drawn these conclusions... having read the item in IZVESTIYA. The people's deputy has not met or had a discussion with the military command that carried out the "redrawing of borders" and the "provocations" necessary for this.... It is a pity that an already hot question is being stoked up in this strange way. So, we will wait for the conclusions of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet official commission that has visited the region.

### Tension Persists in Nagorno-Karabakh Region

*OW1505081991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1235 GMT 14 May 91*

[Text] The situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region remains complex. Three trucks and a bus were fired at in the Mardakert district on Monday. Both the drivers—all Armenians—and their passengers escaped unharmed. In the Gadrut district 24 people from four villages have been detained by the Azerbajani OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] troops for allegedly taking part in military operations.

Railway cargo transportation to the city of Stepanakert is still blocked.

### Situation 'Not Calm'

*LD1505220491 Moscow TASS in English 1803 GMT 14 May 91*

[By TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Stepanakert May 14 TASS—Five military patrols came under attack, with the military returning the fire twice, during the past 24 hours in the disputed enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh in Azerbaijan, which is inhabited mostly by Armenians, as tensions there continued to mount. There were no casualties in those incidents, however.

Gadrut District Police Chief Gamlet Sevumyan told TASS that identity checks were run in seven villages in the area on Monday. They were sealed off by troops and armoured military vehicles from morning and then entered by Azeri police.

A total of 52 Armenians were detained and brought to the neighbouring Azeri town of Dzhebrail, including five women. Most of them were set free on Monday and today, but ten people are still kept in Dzebrail.

Sevumyan said that many local people complain about "illegal outrages" and thefts of their personal belongings. Cattle were driven away and a woman disappeared from the villages of Dzhilyan and Binyatlu. The latter village was abandoned by all its residents today.

Gadrut police claim that their Azeri colleagues found just one home-made sub-machine gun and several cartridges during their raids on the Armenian-inhabited villages.

Contacted by TASS, the military commander of the area under the state of emergency, which includes the Gadrut and Dzhebrail districts, denied the use of troops under him in the operations.

The situation elsewhere in Nagorno-Karabakh was not calm either. Unidentified assailants ambushed a car in the Martunin district, killing its Armenian driver Albert Gukasyan and gravely injuring a passenger.

In the Mardakert District, several motor vehicles, including a bus, came under fire. Also there, two busloads of Azeris in police uniform arrived in the Azeri village at 17:00 on May 13 and opened sub-machine gun fire on the nearby Armenian village of Kichan. It was sheer luck that there were no casualties.

### Azerbaijan Establishes Security Council

*LD1405163891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1530 GMT 14 May 91*

[Text] By decree of Republic of Azerbaijan President Mutalibov, a national security council has been set up. It comprises five people, and is headed by the republican prime minister. The new organ is designed to elaborate recommendations for implementing policy in the field of defense, protecting the state and territorial integrity of the republic, and dealing with the aftermath of emergency situations.

### Azerbaijani Militia Impedes Reporters

*PM1405140791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 May 91 Second Edition pp 1, 8*

[Second part of special correspondent Yu. Shabanov "Report on a Visit to the Zone of Combat Actions:" "In a Land Black with Grief and Anger"]

[Excerpts] Gyandzha-Kazakh-Khanlar—There are two villages like twins—Lower and Upper Askipara: almost empty streets, frightened and at the same time curious faces in the windows of houses. Posts are located here, next to the villages. Officers and soldiers in full combat gear. Some are eating from cans with a knife, sitting in combat vehicles, others are on duty. A portable radio transceiver crackles in a trench beneath camouflage. The country's armed forces are fulfilling their duty.

To begin with, the soldiers greeted us not very affably and took a long time to ascertain who we were and where we had come from and to check our documents. Well, this is all understandable, for it is a combat situation. They made us switch off our tape recorders but let us take notes. They showed us their trophies: an armored personnel carrier and two hail guns. They also said that they had confiscated dozens of submachine guns and pistols, ammunition for them, grenades, and a transceiver from Armenian guerrillas.

We looked around. Several local residents had gathered outside the last houses in the village. The roofs and walls of some buildings had been destroyed and the window frames and doors dislodged—the work of Armenian guerrillas' guns.

"It all began 29 April," the officers said. "Armenian guerrillas began firing intensively on Azerbaijan territory. We came here and set up posts. There is another one over there, in the mountains beyond the Armenian village of Voskepar, in the five-kilometer security zone. The nearby villages on the Armenian side have been

turned into major guerrilla bases, and many of them are hiding in the mountains. We seek them out and disarm them. If armed resistance is offered us, we retaliate."

"Why are you here, and not Internal Troops?"

"There are Internal Troops, too. But they do not have sufficient forces to fulfill the presidential decree on disarming illegal military formations. Soviet Army subunits are helping them, protecting residents."

Of course, the calm here is relative, for there is still shooting. [passage omitted]

In the evening we read in IZVESTIYA a statement by L. Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian legislature. "Using helicopters, tanks, and heavy artillery, subunits of the 4th Army of Soviet troops stationed on the territory of Azerbaijan razed the village of Voskepar in Armenia's Noyemberyanskiy Rayon. All the houses were destroyed, and nearby orchards and woods were burned. Dozens have been killed." The statement was conveyed to Armenia's permanent mission in Moscow on the evening of 6 May. We stood 100 meters above the totally intact village and photographed it on the afternoon of 7 May. Not one house had been destroyed. The only dead were guerrillas who had offered resistance.

This is how a monstrous lie is created for the purpose of discrediting the army. Is it possible after this to believe other statements by the head of the Armenian legislature?

We never got to the villages of Chaykend and Martunashen. Azerbaijani militiamen stopped us on the mountain approaches to it and literally threw us back into the vehicle. We said that Militia Colonel Mamedov, Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] deputy minister of internal affairs, was there in Chaykend, waiting for us. Zero attention. Finally they let through an ensign who was accompanying us this time. He drove to the next post, where he met with the colonel. The latter told him that the situation had become more complicated and so there was nothing for journalists to do there. As we drove back, two vehicles with local militiamen followed us in the mountains.

Again secrecy. Why? Were they worried about us? Did they want to hide something? For such a conclusion might suggest itself. The Armenian side says: Members of the Special Purpose Militia Detachment repatriated the residents, looted their property, and destroyed the village itself. Incidentally, we heard the same version from some soldiers stationed in Azerbaijan. But spokesmen for the Azerbaijan SSR maintain that they moved the residents at their own request, having paid them money for their houses and sending their goods and chattels on after them, and that the village is intact. Who is to be believed? If the truth is on the Azerbaijani side, why did they not show Chaykend to us journalists—and that would have ended all the talk.

We would not want to conjecture. But vehicles driven by the militia passed us from Chaykend with the household property of its residents. Where were they going? Following the owner..? Or...? Once again this accursed "or," which torments your soul with doubts. Let us meet with the Special Purpose Militia Detachment members themselves and with the Armenian population moved from the village! They did not let us. Did people write an application to leave? Probably. It is oh so hard to live in such a situation—a most veritable hell. A major of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry Internal Troops with whom we met said: Yes, they did apply, some later made their way back under pressure from Armenian guerrillas but applied again. Helicopters landed and people went toward them, but Armenian guerrillas barred their way with submachine guns and did not let them through. Somehow they persuaded 1,600 people to leave. But we did not see any applications or any repatriated people. Where is the truth?

Nor did we secure the complete truth in conversation with A. Agayev, chief of the Azerbaijan Republic Prosecutor's Office Investigative Department. He said, for example, that on 6 May, according to a soldiers' report, more than 50 Armenian guerrillas attacked a troop detail. They responded by using weapons. The guerrillas surrendered. They are now in Kazakh—in cells pending trial. More than 40 people. An investigative team has arrived from the republic prosecutor's office. Criminal proceedings have been instituted against the guerrillas.

"Many of them," Agayev added, "say that they are militiamen and came on a mission. But if there is a mission, there must also be travel orders—but there is no trace of them. There are no documents at all. And they are certainly not dressed in militia uniform—they are dressed any old how."

Then we nonetheless insisted on speaking with the detainees.

"You will be able to put just one question: 'Are you militiamen? Then why are you without uniforms and documents?'"

We wanted to ask a lot of questions, but....

Two tall and strong guys of approximately 40 or so were brought out to us. One had a big black eye, which he dabbed from time to time with a damp handkerchief. We asked the questions and turned on our tape recorders.

"Turn them off at once," the chief of the investigative department shouted.

Mine had evidently jammed and did not switch off. This was the conversation that ensued.

"I am a Soviet officer, a militiaman," the one with grayish hair said. "My own men took my uniform...."

"Wait, wait," Agayev interrupted him.

"My documents...," the one with the black eye began....

"Wait, wait. Did we take you in, feed you, and help you?"

"Thank you, of course. Now we will explain...."

A new intervention:

"No, no...."

We were shown the door. The photographer took one last shot. Not enough. Understandably, there is investigative secrecy. But we were more interested in the moral reasons why these people had come armed to their neighbors. And this would have had no effect on the course of the investigation. In any case, it is possible not to allow detainees to answer questions that are undesirable for the investigation but still to arrange a dialogue with journalists. Alas....

In short, we were returning to Moscow without fully understanding the situation on the border. [passage omitted]